



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review



LELAND · STANFORD · JUNIOR · UNIVERSITY

2303-26.523-

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. cccxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XVII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1892.

LIBRARY
OF THE
BIBLIOTHECA MUSEI HISTORICO-NATURALIS
MUSEI HISTORICO-NATURALIS
MUSEI HISTORICO-NATURALIS

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

134301

COPYRIGHT, 1892.

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

MAHONY
HARDY & MAHONY
NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
NATIONALISM. THE CONCLAVE AND THE NEXT POPE. By <i>Rt. Rev. Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.</i> ,	1
Untimely curiosity regarding the immediate successor of Leo XIII., and the place where the next conclave will be held, 1; People should not be misled by the action of the Italian Government, 2; Why Italy will protect the meeting of the next conclave in Rome, 3; Whether the Holy Father seriously contemplates the necessity of leaving Rome, 4; What may necessitate this, 5; Reasons why the next conclave will be in Rome and the next Pope an Italian, 6; Action of the Spanish Court, 7; Action of the French, German and Russian Governments, 8, 9; Will the next Pope reside in Rome, 10; The Vicar of Christ the Bishop of Rome as well as the Bishop of Bishops, 10-12; Description of the various departments of ecclesiastical administration, 13-16; How the ecclesiastical records have always been pillaged whenever the Pope was driven from Rome, 17; The position of Leo XIII., 18, 19.	
CONSCIOUS ACTS. By <i>Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J.</i> ,	20
What consciousness is: the intellect as directly conscious, and as reflexly conscious, 20; The first object actually known by the intellect, 21, 22; When the action of the intellect is reflex or introspective, 23; Direct consciousness of self the nearest approach of the human intellect, in our present state of existence, towards apprehending the concrete <i>singular</i> , 24; An organic faculty is incapable of either direct or reflexive consciousness, 25; Whether the intellect in its consciousness apprehends only its own acts, 26; The soul considered as knowing itself under two respects, 27; Dr. Reid's inaccuracies and errors, 28, 29; Errors of Mill, Sir William Hamilton agreeing with Luther, 30; St. Thomas, 31.	
"IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, IN OMNIBUS CARITAS." By <i>B. B.</i> ,	32
What we are to understand by " <i>necessary</i> " things, 32; How far are non-Catholics culpable in refusing to believe in the divine mission of the Catholic Church and in what she proposes for our belief? 33-35; " <i>In Dubiis Libertas</i> ," what this means, 36; The claims of reason upon us; what we are free to hold as true and what not, 37, 38; The Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican, 39, 40; The Syllabus 41; Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, views of Cardinal Newman and Canon Bartolo, 41, 42; Refutation of Canon Bartolo's ideas, 43, 45.	
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS. NO. I. DESTINY—PREPARATION. By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> ,	47
Christopher Columbus a man of destiny, 47; What Columbus himself said on this subject, 48; What others thought and said, 49, 50; Significance of the names Columbus received, 51; Tendency of modern writers to ignore every Providential circumstance in Columbus's life, 52; Columbus's own convictions, 53; Contention about the birthplace of Columbus, 54; Columbus training for his subsequent career, 55, 56; His youthful occupations and pursuits, 57, 58; His residence in Portugal, 59, 60; His favorite studies, 61; His noble physique, 62; His marriage and occupations in Portugal, 63; Portuguese discoveries in Africa and Asia, 64, 65; Columbus's wife's father, 66; A malignant calumny, 67; The results of Columbus's seven years' residence in Lisbon, 68; Testimonies of historians to his exalted character and genius, 69-71.	
AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE. By <i>Very Rev. Mgr. Joseph Schroeder, D.D.</i> ,	72
An objection stated, 72; Certain undeniable facts, 73; The true question, 74; What the writer excludes from his discussion and what he proposes to prove, 75, 76; An indirect answer and a direct answer, 77, 78; Popular sovereignty as a political principle, 79-81; A two-fold conclusion, 82; Catholic citizens can acknowledge the right of self-government without detriment to their religious principles, 83; The spoliation of the Papal States considered as a mere political event, 84; The Bishop of Rome by divine right must rule the Church, freely and independently, 85; To this end the Temporal Power is necessary, at present, 86; The occupation of Rome will ever be a sacrilege, 87; Duty of Catholics to speak out, plainly and boldly, 88; <i>Salus Publica Suprema Lex</i> , 89; The respective objects of the Church and of the State, 90; The welfare of the whole Church demands the re-establishment of the Temporal Power, 91, 92; The re-establishment of the Temporal Power a benefit to Italy itself, 93, 94; Washington, D. C., and Rome, 95; Conclusion, 96, 97.	
OUR YOUNG MEN—WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THEM? By <i>Rev. Michael J. Lavelle</i> ,	98
The honored approval of this movement not only by eminent prelates but by the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church, 98; The need of this movement, 99-101; Its earliest projectors, 102; Mistakes rather than faults, 103; Accomplished results of the movement, 104; The National Union, 105; Diocesan Unions, 106-108.	
NEW FORMS OF OLD ERRORS. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B. A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	109
The countless varieties of error, 109; The self-contradictions of Ritualism, 110, 111; Broad-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen, 112, 113; New methods of assailing the Catholic Church, 114, 115; Protestant attempts at unity, 116; Welsh dissenters and the Established Church, 116; Co-operation impossible, 117; The new enemies of	

	PAGE
Anglicanism, 118; Church defence, 119; Structural, doctrinal and co-operative unities, 120; The Ritualist pretension, 121; New forms of old errors must necessarily arise outside the Catholic Church, 122.	
THE MOSAIC LAW IN THE LIGHT OF ETHICS. By <i>Rev. Anthony Maas, S.J.</i> , 123	123
The Mosaic Law did not destroy the freedom of the human will, 123; Nor does it suppose the absence of a future life, or the perishable nature of the human soul, 124; The Pentateuch is not responsible for the real or imaginary immoral practices of the Jews, 125; The assertion that Jehovah was a mere tribal God, 126, 127; That Jehovah was a type of cruelty and vengeance, 123; That human sacrifices and prostitution were essential parts of the primitive Hebrew worship, 128, 129; Three points that must be considered, 130; The Mosaic Laws respecting marriage and divorce, 131; Polygamy and concubinage, 132-135; The will of God expressed in the law given to the Israelites tends irresistibly towards the greatest good, 135, 136.	
PIUS IX. AND THE REVOLUTION—1846-1848. By <i>John A. Mooney, LL.D.</i> , 137	137
The scene at the proclamation of Pius IX. as Pope, 137; General satisfaction throughout the world, 138; Jealousy and fears of the disciples of assassination, 139; The masses ignorant of Mazzini's plans, 140; Many well-meaning persons deceived, 141; The clubs and their journals, 142; Italian liberalism, 142; The schools and universities tainted with Josephism, 143; Gioberti, 143; Mazzini jealous of him, 145; His writings and real character, 146-150; Mazzini and Gioberti compared, 151; The anti-Jesuit cry, 152; What it meant, 153; Mob rule, 154; The civic guard, 155; Charles Bonaparte, Terenzio Mamiani, Galletti, Brunetti and their characters, 156-158; Austria and Pius IX., 159; The mob and Pius IX., 160.	
CATHOLICITY IN ENGLAND FIFTY YEARS AGO—A RETROSPECT. PART I. By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i> , 161	161
The affinity between "Great and Greater Britain," 161; The writer, when a Protestant schoolboy, Dr. Ward, Frederick Oakeley, 162; Paucity of Catholics, especially among the poor, 163; Of whom the Catholics chiefly consisted, 164; The Catholic clergy, 165; A. W. Pugin, John Hardman, Amrose de Lisle, George Spence, Darwin, Owen, 167; Milner's "End of Controversy," 168; The writer's visit to St. Chad's, 169; Dr. Walsh, Cardinal Wiseman, Father Faber, Mr. Scott Murray, 170; Rev. John Moore, 171; The old Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny, 172; St. Mary's, Oscott, 173; M. Peter le Page Renouf, 174; A. W. Pugin's character, 175.	
SECULAR EDUCATION. By <i>Rt. Rev. Thomas A. Becker, D.D.</i> , 176	176
The writer's intention, 176; Discussions unprofitable, when terms are not accurately and clearly defined, 177; Education and instruction—what they respectively mean, 178; Its results to the Greeks and to the Romans, 179; The morals of Prussia, 180; Of Scotland, 181; Of our own country, 182, 183; No state, saving a Theocracy, can or ought to be the dispenser of instruction, and much less of education, 184; The wrong done to Catholics by taxing them to support schools they cannot consentitiously patronize, 186; Why the wrong continues, 187; With every advance in secular knowledge there should be a co-equal advance in our knowledge of our duties to God and to our fellow-men, 188; Signs of a change for the better in public opinion, 189, 190.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> , 191	191
Aerial navigation, past, present and future, 191-201; A new diving dress, 202; A monster pumping engine, 202; The Pacific Coast survey, 203; A new smokeless powder; An amphibious velocipede; An electric snow sweeper, 203-205.	
BOOK NOTICES, 206-224	206-224
THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN PROPHECY. By <i>Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, D.D., C.S.P.</i> , 225	225
Two-fold manner in which prophecy presents the Catholic idea, 225; Protestant and Catholic ideas of the Church, 226, 227; The Greek Church, 228; The Redeemer typified in His precursors, 229, 230; What the prophets foretold respecting the Church, 231, 232; The Church as typified in foregoing dispensations, 233; Prophecies respecting the teaching authority of the Church, its indefectibility and its priesthood, 234, 235; Vocation of the Gentiles to the priesthood foretold, 236; The prophet Jeremiah, 237; The prophet Malachi, 238, 239; The prophet Daniel, 240, 241; The second book of Machabees, 242; Where alone the fulfilment of these prophecies can be found, 243, 244; What St. Paul teaches, 245, 246; The whole Christian religion embodied in the Catholic Church as a corporate, organic unity, 247; The Church as described in the Apocalypse, 248; The place the Church occupies in history, 249; Various unsuccessful attempts to explain this away, 250, 251; Conclusion, 252.	
BEATRICE AND OTHER ALLEGORICAL CHARACTERS OF DANTE ALIGHIERI. By <i>Rev. James Conway, S.J.</i> , 253	253
The critical appreciation of Dante's poetry depends on the view taken of Beatrice, 253; The "Vita Nuova" and the "Convito," 254; Dante's first meeting Beatrice, 255; The place given to Beatrice in his poems, 256; Dante's grief on the death of Beatrice, 257; His first inspiration of the "Divina Comedia," 258; Beatrice is solely an allegorical figure in the "Divina Comedia," 259; Various interpretations of critics, 260; The writer's own interpretation, 261; The Church, the spouse of Christ, is typified in Beatrice, 262; Objections answered, 263; The allegorical character of Dante's poetry, 264-270; His Lucy and Matilda, 271, 272; Virgil's part is simply ideal, 273; Concluding remarks, 274, 275.	

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
"FATHER HERMAN." By <i>Theodora L. L. Teeling</i> ,	276
A memorable festival at Lyons thirty years ago, 276; Who "Father Herman" was, 277; His wonderful genius for music from earliest childhood, 278; His youthful career in Paris and more than questionable acquaintances, 279, 280; His wonderful conversion, 281-283; His entrance into the Carmelite Order, 284, 285; Conversion of many of his near relatives, 286; His renown as a musician and as a preacher, 287; His preaching in Paris, 288; Its results, 289; Conversion of his youngest brother and other relatives, 290; Bitter opposition of his father, 292-294; Establishing a branch of the Order in Lyons, 295; He is sent to England, scene at Newgate, 297; Retires to Tarastelx, 298; Goes to Germany to minister to French prisoners, 299; His edifying death, 300.	
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—THE PROPHECY—THE OFFER—THE ACCEPTANCE By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> ,	301
The motives that controlled Columbus, 301; Was his discovery divinely foretold, 302; Significance of his name, 303; Belief of Columbus on the subject, 304; The reasons he gave for his theories, 306; Poetical predictions of his discovery, 307, 308; His correspondence with Toscauelli, 309, 310; To whom he first made his proposals, 311, 312; Providential rejection of his proposals by Portugal, Genoa and Venice, 313; His meeting Father Juan Perez, 314; His second marriage, 315; His first audience with Ferdinand and Isabella, 316; His proposals referred to a learned committee, 317; Their objections answered by Columbus, 318; The war with the Moors delays, 319; Columbus at La Rabida, 320; The terms demanded by Columbus rejected, 322; The grief of his friends, 324; Isabella assumes the whole cost of the expedition, 325; Preparations for the voyage, 326, 327; The frightful open sea which it was popularly supposed would have to be encountered, 328-332.	
CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE. By <i>Very Rev. John Hogan, S.S., D.D.</i> ,	333
The position France occupied thirty years ago, 333; Its present condition perplexing to most Americans, 334, 335; French republicans resolved from their first beginning to persecute the Church, 336; The purpose of the government to remove every trace of religion from its official action, 337; How the government suppressed the Religious Orders, 338; How the hospital sisters and Christian brothers are treated, 339; Compulsory military service, 340; The secularization of the schools, 341; Why the French republic is hostile to the Church, 342-345; Can the Republicans crush the Church in France? 344; Various considerations bearing on the question, 346-348; What recent experience teaches, 349-351; Concluding remarks, 352-355.	
THE LAST OF THREE GREAT ENGLISH CARDINALS—HIS SPECIAL WORK. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	356
Why Cardinal Manning was venerated, 356; Cardinals Wiseman and Newman, and the special work each of them performed, 357; Distinguished English converts to the Catholic faith, 358; Five things that Cardinal Manning successfully accomplished, 359-362; Cardinal Manning as a writer, 363; And as a preacher, 364; What figure he will make in history, 365; What the working classes say about him, 366, 367; What he did for them, 368.	
CATHOLIC ASTRONOMERS. By <i>Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S.J.</i> ,	369
Rev. Stephen J. Perry, S.J., and the work he did, 369, 370; The position of the Catholic Church towards science, 371; Illogical arguments of certain scientists, 372; Two errors, 373; The first era of astronomy, 374; What Catholic astronomers then did, 375; Picard, Gassendi, Pazzi, DeVico, Cassini, Miraldi, Castelli, Bianchi, 376; The Jesuits and their numerous observatories, 377; Leverrier, 378; Father Secchi, 379; Other distinguished Catholic astronomers, 380; What has been accomplished at the Georgetown College observatory, 381.	
THE TWO KENRICKS. By <i>Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, M.R.I.A.</i> ,	382
The parents of these illustrious prelates, 382; Education of Francis Patrick, 383; His coming to this country and his labors in Kentucky, 384; Appointed coadjutor-bishop and administrator of the diocese of Philadelphia, 385; The trustees of St. Mary's Church, 386; The younger brother, Peter Richard, where he was born and educated, 387; His coming to this country, the work he did in Philadelphia, 388; His writings, 389, 390; The elder brother, Francis Patrick, and his writings, 391, 392; Peter Richard appointed coadjutor to Bishop Rosati and administrator of the Diocese of St. Louis, 393; Death of Bishop Rosati, 394; St. Louis made an archdiocese, 394, 395; Bishop Francis Patrick transferred to Baltimore, 396; His labors there and his death, 397; Bishop Peter Richard at the Vatican Council, 398; Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan appointed coadjutor to Archbishop Kenrick and subsequently made archbishop of Philadelphia, 399; Archbishop Kenrick's golden jubilee, 400; Preparations for celebrating it, 401, 402; The impressive religious ceremonies, 403; Magnificent torchlight procession, 404; Congratulatory addresses and letters, 405, 406.	
IN MEMORIAM—CARDINAL MANNING. By <i>His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons</i> ,	407
The cause of Manning's pre-eminence, 407; His colossal labors, 408; The change in English opinion about the Church, 409; Manning's deep interest in the working classes, 410.	
IN MEMORIAM—JOHN GILMARY SHEA. By <i>George D. Wolff, LL.D.</i> ,	411
General sorrow over Dr. Shea's death; his connection with the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, his varied acquirements and many admirable qualities, 411, 412.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> ,	413
When lights to guide sailors were first employed, 413; The first lighthouse, 414; Carduan lighthouse, 415; The Eddystone lighthouse, the Bell Rock, and other	

famous lighthouses; their history and construction, 416-420; Waves of oscillation and of translation, 421-423; The immense power of waves, 425; Brief Scientific Notes: Flexible Glass, 426; A new star in Andromeda, 427; Electric lights at the World's Fair, 428; Crossing the Atlantic in three days, 429; Fishing by electric light, 430; An enormous microscope, 431; Book Notices, 432-448.

MATTER AND FORM IN BIOLOGY. By *Thomas Dwight, M.D., LL.D.*, . . . 449

The scholastic doctrine on this subject, 449; Intention of the article, 450; Illustrations of the effect of the mechanical resistance of certain parts of the body on the development of other parts, 451; The two opposing theories, 451; Professor Cope's theory, 452; Professor Culman's, 453; Other instances of the effect of mechanical action, 454-456; Artificial production of monstrosities, 451; Heredity turned into an idol, 458; The difficulties that beset materialistic theories, 459; Phenomena which Darwinians claim are fatal to non-evolutionary theories, 460; They offer no real difficulty if we accept the doctrine of Aristotle and of St. Thomas, 461.

PIUS IX. AMID FRIENDS AND FOES, 1848. By *John A. Mooney, LL.D.*, . . . 463

Suggestive words of Pius IX., 463; The Paris revolution and demonstrations at Berlin and at Vienna, 464; Hypocrisy of Charles Albert, 465; How the lying revolutionists used the Pope's name, 466; Pius IX. refuses to declare war; his famous allocution, 467; The Mazzinians and Lord Palmerston, 468; The Austrians victorious, 469; Demonstrations of the clubs against Pius, 470; The Pope in the hands of the mob, 471; Mamiani's treachery, 472; Gioberti's speculations, 473, 474, 475; The Federative Congress, 476; Antonio Rosmini, 477, 478; His philosophic speculations, 479, 480; His political notions, 481; Gioberti and Rosmini, 482; Rossi, his firmness and sagacity, 483, 484; His assassination, 485; The ministry chosen by the mob, 486; Pius declines being dictated to but submits to force, 487; Rosmini again in Rome, his officious intermeddling, 488; His nomination to the Presidency of the Council, 488-489; Flight of the Pope from Rome, 490.

EARLY CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM. By *Rt. Rev. Mgr. Robert Seton, DD.*, . . . 491

The early Christian symbolism, 491; Clement of Alexandria on the subject, 492; Origin of the early Christian symbols, 493; The lamb as a symbol of Christ, 494-496; The deer as a symbol, 497; The hare, 498; The lion, the calf, the serpent, 499; Tree and serpent worship, 500; Birds, real or chimerical; The eagle, the cock, the dove, 501, 502; The fish, 503; Trees as symbols, 504, 505; The sun and the moon, 506; The signs of the zodiac, the four seasons, 507.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—THE ACCOMPLISHMENT. By *Richard F. Clarke, LL.D.*, . . . 508

The vessels and their crews, 508; The departure, 509; Discovery of the deflection of the needle, 510; Fears of the sailors and danger of a mutiny, 511; Sagacious noting of every sign of land by Columbus, 512; Land discovered, his sublime and devout thanksgiving, 513; His discovering other islands; his shipwreck; the treachery of Marton Alonzo Pinzon, 514; Columbus returns to Spain, 515; His reception; Fitting out a new expedition, 516; Provision made for the spiritual needs of the Indians and of the colonists, 517; Principal events of this second expedition; Arriving at La Navidad, Columbus finds the fortress demolished and the garrison murdered, 518; Building the new city of Isabella, 519; Firm measures; his enemies, 520; Return of Columbus to Spain, 521; How he was treated, 522; Mutual jealousies of Portugal and Spain, 523; The division line decreed by Pope Alexander VI., 524; The treaty of Tordesillas, 525; Third expedition of Columbus, 526; How Columbus was slandered and calumniated, 527, 528; Bobadilla appointed to inquire into the state of the colony in Hispaniola, 529; Columbus and his brothers sent in chains to Spain, 530, 531; His arrival; the impression it made, 532; The cruelties inflicted on the Indians under the new governors, 533, 534; Geographical errors in that age, 535, 536; The fourth voyage of Columbus, 537; The services rendered to geographical knowledge, 538; His purpose to found a new colony frustrated, 539; Shipwrecked and exiled, 540; Mutiny and rebellion of part of his crew, 541; Conclusion, 542.

THE HIERARCHY IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES. By *Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, DD., C.S.P.*, . . . 543

The sense in which the term "hierarchy" is used, 543; The precise point to be proved and the method adopted, 544; Episcopacy in the year 200 was in universal possession, 545; Testimonies of learned Protestant authorities, 546-549; What was the organization of the Church at that time, 550, 551; Priesthood in the Christian Church is correlated to the Real Presence in the Eucharist, 552; The universal tradition in the Church in the second century, 553; Testimony of St. Cyprian, 554; His concept of the Church, 556, 557; What Harnack says, 558, 559; St. Cyprian on the priesthood, on the Real Presence, on the unity of the Church, 560-562; Wide difference between the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood and Protestant conceptions, 563; Neander's testimony, 564; Tertullian, 565; St. Irenæus, 565-568; Protestant attempts to explain away these testimonies, what St. Irenæus says, 569, 570; St. Ignatius, 571, 572; Episcopal constitution of the churches in the first century, 573, 574; What the question involves, 575; The degrees of progress in the organization of the churches, 576; Conclusion, 577.

THE ANGLICAN THEORY OF CONTINUITY. By *Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)*, . . . 573

The theory and what is necessary to vindicate it, 578; The government of the early Church, 579; Dr. Dollinger, 580; The Church of England the child of the Church of Rome, 581; Venerable Bede, Sts. Cyprian, Irenæus, Cyril, Papias, Hilary and Augustine, 582; Sir Thomas Moore, Bishop Fisher and Henry VIII., 583, 584; Testimony of the Church of England that it was not a continuation of the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, 585; The assertion that the papal power

	PAGE
grew out of the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs, 586, 587; Henry VIII. and the Six Articles, 588; The "Ecclesia Docens" in England, 589; The sham consecration of a Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, 590; The Anglican idea opposed to Church Unity, 591; The point for Anglicans to consider, 592, 593; Instances in which kings submitted all spiritual matters to Popes, 594; A picture of Anglican "divine" worship, 595; Hard questions for Anglicans to answer, 596; The Catholic Church the kingdom of God on earth, 597; Summing up, 598, 599; Conclusion, 600, 601.	
COMPOSTELLA AND THE SHRINE OF ST. JAMES. By <i>Right Rev. Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, LL.D.</i> ,	602
A Phœnician ship in Arlosa Bay in the year 43, 602; Its precious freight, the body of St. James, 603; Its burial at Libredon, 604; Persecutions of the Spanish Christians, 605; The precise spot where the Salut was buried forgotten, 606; Its rediscovery, 607, 608; Erection of a basilica over the Salut's remains, 609; Unsuccessful attempt of Amanzor to violate the tomb of the Salut, 610; The basilica rebuilt and enlarged, 611; Ruined by fire in 1175, but completely renovated in 1188, 612, 613; Description of the basilica, 614, 615; Fear lest the piratical Drake would desecrate the shrine, and measures taken to obliterate all traces of the tomb, 616; Its rediscovery, 617; The process of identifying the remains, 618-620.	
SOME AMERICAN NOVELS. By <i>Maurice Francis Egan, LL.D.</i> ,	621
The novel of the nineteenth century, 621; English novelists and American; the difference, 622; Marion Crawford, 623; His "Three Fates," 624; His love of splendor and the romantic, 625; Analysis of his first novel, 626; His avoiding "nasty" subjects, 627; Characteristics of several other novels of Mr. Crawford, 628-633.	
THE REGENTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. By <i>Rev. J. F. Mullaney</i> ,	635
What the University of New York now is, 634; History of its organization, 634, 635; University not fully understood, 636; Character of the regents, 637; Catholic institutions connected with the university, 638; Advantages of this connection, 639, 740; An objection answered, 641; Concluding remarks, 642, 643.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> ,	644
Light-houses and other aids to navigation in the United States, 644; The first record of a beacon light in the United States, 644; Number of light-houses when the Federal Government took charge of the harbors and navigable waters, 645; How much the number increased in a hundred years, 645; How we compare with other lands, 646; The true theory of coast-lighting, 647; Other aids to navigation, 649; Buoys, 650; Guns, 651; Fog-bells, 652; Whistling-huoy, bell-buoys and fog-trumpet, 653, 654; The siren, 655; A great dam, 656; Elevator notes, 657; The Ramie fibre once more, 658; Motive power at the World's Fair, 659, 660.	
BOOK NOTICES,	661-672
THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By <i>Very Rev. Augustine F. Hecht, D.D., LL.D.</i> ,	673
The ideal form of Christianity must be in the New Testament, 673; Whence Protestants derive their false conceptions of Christianity, 674; What the New Testament is made up of, 675; What the writer proposes to prove, 676; The idea of primitive Christianity common to Puritanism and Rationalism, 677; Roman and other anti-Catholic writers, 678; The unity of the Catholic Church, 679; Hierarchy of the Catholic Church, 680-689; The alleged lack of clearly marked distinction between bishops and priests, 690-692; The allegation answered, 693-696; The New Testament teaches the Catholic doctrine respecting the special sacraments of the Gospel, 697, 698; The priesthood is especially correlated to sacrifice, 699; Why the Christian mysteries were veiled from the profane and uninitiated, 699, 691; Yet hints and allusions to them are not lacking, 692-694; The infallible authority of the Ecclesia Docens, 695; No other rule of faith recognized in the New Testament, 696, 697; The supreme Apostolate and the supreme episcopate—to whom given, 697, 698; Conclusion, 699, 700.	
THE CHURCH AND ENGLISH LIBERTY. By <i>Michael Hennessey</i> ,	701
The mission of the Church, 701; Condition of England when Augustine landed, 702; Ethelbert's code of laws, 703; The civil law and the canon law in the days of Gregory IX., 704; The laws and customs of the Anglo-Saxons, 705; The condition of things under the Normans, 706, 707; The Magna Charta, 708; By whom it was obtained, 709; Other great bulwarks of English liberty, 710; When the English Constitution reached almost its greatest perfection, 711; Whence its principles were derived, 712-714.	
ENGLISH KINGS AND ROMAN PONTIFFS. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon)</i> ,	715
Persons born in a national church cannot grasp the idea of the Catholic Church, 715; The Catholic Church is for the whole world, 716; Truths which Protestant writers overlook, 716, 717; The controversy between the temporal and the spiritual—what it involves, 718, 719; Local customs must not be confused with points of faith, 720; Contentions of Catholic Prelates with English kings, 721; Contentions of the Holy See with them, 722; Appeals, investitures, provisors—what they were, 723; St. Thomas à Becket and Henry II., 724; Context of King John's contention with the Holy See, 825; The English Barons and the "Great Charter," 726; Not all the English kings were wilful, 727; Kings Egbert, Oswy, Alfred, William the Conqueror, 728; The temporal and the spiritual always kept distinct in Catholic times, 729; Recent decision of the Privy Council respecting the Anglican Bishop of Lincoln, 730; The contrast it presents with contentions during the Middle Ages, 731, 732.	

	PAGE
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS — INGRATITUDE — MISFORTUNES — POSTHUMOUS HONORS. By <i>Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.</i> ,	733
Return of Columbus from his fourth and last expedition, 733; Mental agonies of Columbus, 734; Columbus and the Holy Sec, 735; Columbus and Americus Vesputius, 736; The name given to the New World, 737; Columbus and King Ferdinand, 738, 739; Poverty of Columbus, 740; His sufferings, fortitude and patience, 740, 741; Mr. Prescott's opinion of Ferdinand's treatment of Columbus, 742; The persistent hatred with which Columbus was pursued even to his grave, 743; Nearing the end—his preparation for it, 744; His will, 745; The unjust charges brought against Columbus, 746-749; Las Casas, 750, 751; Columbus defended his Indian subjects, 752; What Mr. Irving says, 753; Father Knight's answer, 754; Fortitude and resignation of Columbus, 755, 756; His death, 757; Where and by whom he was buried, 758; Where his remains now are, 759, 760; Posthumous honors to Columbus, 761, 762; Different portraits of Columbus, 763, 764; Descendants of Columbus, 765; Monuments, relics and other memorials of Columbus, 766-769; Letter of the Holy Father, 770, 771; Concluding remarks, 772.	
A RETROPECT (Continued). By <i>St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i> ,	753
St. Mary's College at Ascott, 771; Growth of the Church in England, 775; Desire for the re-establishment of the hierarchy in England, 776; Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral, 777, 778; Lord Russell's letter to the Bishop of Durham, 779, 780; The Ecclesiastical Titles Act, 781; Speedy abatement of the storm, 781; Louis Veuillot, 783; Restoring the Peter's Pence tribute, 784, 785.	
THE FRIARS OF THE WEST INDIES. By <i>J. I. Rodriguez</i> ,	786
Difference between the work of the monks in Europe and in America, 786; Their work in Spain, 787, 788; Peculiar difficulties in America, 789; Will justice be done to the monks in the Columbus celebration, 790; The Holy Father's letter, 791; Immense benefits conferred on America by the monks, 792; The first school opened in America, 793; How the monks have been persecuted, 796; Franciscans were the first ecclesiastics that came to America, 797; The Franciscans and intellectual development, 799-801; The Franciscan convents in Cuba, 802-805; When the Dominicans first came to America, 806; Their denunciations of slavery, 807, 808; Their going to Cuba, 809; Their convents and university, 810, 811; Other religious orders in Cuba, 812.	
THE NIMBUS AND AUREOLE. By <i>Ellis Schreiber</i> ,	813
The essential glory of God, 813; What Moses, the Psalmist, Ezekiel, and St. Paul say, 813, 814; The visions of St. John, 815; The glory of God is communicated to the spirits in heaven, 816; His ineffable light is sometimes reflected even from the bodies of saints, 817; Historical instances, 818; Description of the nimbus, 819; How the Greeks and Romans represented those to whom they ascribed divine honors, 820; When the nimbus was first adopted in Christian art, 821; To whom the nimbus was first given, 822; Its usual form, 823; When the aureole first appeared in Christian art, 824; Description of it, 825, 826.	
COLUMBUS AND THE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL. By <i>John A. Mooney, LL.D.</i> ,	827
Columbus the victim of perfidy and calumny, 827; The best way to expose the calumnies, 828; Justin Winsor, 829; His pretentiousness more amusing than even his attempts at humor, 830; Winsor and Washington Irving, Winsor on Prescott, Humboldt and Henry Harrisse, 831, 832; Winsor and Rossely de Lourges, 833; Winsor's English, 834; His descriptions, 835; Winsor contrasted with Froude, 836; Eugene Lawrence and Aaron Goodrich, 837; Winsor on French biographers of Columbus, 838; How Winsor manipulates dates, 839; Winsor's blank verse, 840; Winsor on the letters of Columbus, 841; Winsor the "accelerator," 842; Winsor and slavery, 843; Huxley, 844; Charles Kendall Adams, 845-848; His "eternal verities," 849; Mr. Adams and the Catholic religion, 850; Mr. Irving on Columbus, 851; The glory of Columbus, 852.	
IS IRISH HOME-RULE NEAR? By <i>Bryan J. Clinch</i> ,	853
The persistence of the Irish struggle for freedom, 853; The present a critical period, 854; Mr. Gladstone and the unity of the British empire, 855; Main points of the next Home-Rule Bill, 856; Gladstone's chief reason for advocating Home-Rule, 857; Amount to be paid by Ireland to the British treasury, 858; The kind of government proposed, 859; What six years have done, 860; Wide divergences of opinion, 861; The greatest danger that threatens Home-Rule, 862; The Parnellite members, 863, 864; Mr. Gladstone must be allowed wide discretion, 865; The present is the crisis of Ireland's fate, 866.	
OUR PAROCHIAL SCHOOL SYSTEM. THE PROGRESS IT HAS MADE AND IS MAKING. By <i>George D. Wolff, LL.D.</i> ,	867
Fallacious assertions respecting our parochial schools, 867; A <i>reductio ad absurdum</i> , 868; The number of Catholic children of practical school age, 869; What Catholics have done to provide for the education of their children, 870; Rapid increase of parochial schools, 871; A few words to pessimist friends, 872; The necessity for parochial schools, 873.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE—LIGHT-HOUSE CONSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES. By <i>Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> ,	873
The Old Minot's Ledge Light-House, 873; Its construction, 874; Its destruction; causes of it, 875; The New Minot's ledge Light-House, 876; Difficulties of constructing it, 877; Description of it, 878, 879; Screw-pile light-houses, 880; Other types, 881; The Navesink light-houses, 882; Range of visibility at sea, 883, 884.	
BOOK NOTICES,	885-896

BOOK NOTICES.

	PAGE		PAGE
A Martyr of Our Own Times.....	670	Manual of Church History.....	445
American Catholics and the Roman Question.....	440	Mary, Queen of May, and other "Ave Maria" Essays.....	447
Aquinas Ethicus; or, The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas.....	000	Mathias Corvinus, Koenig von Ungarn, 1458-1490.....	219
Canon of the Old Testament.....	222	Meditations on the Principal Truths of Religion and on the Hidden and Public Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ.....	670
Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions.....	446	Meditations for every day in the year, Collected from Different Spiritual Writers and Suited for the Practice Called "Quarter of an Hour's Solitude".....	669
Christianity or Infallibility. Both or Neither.....	443	Memoirs of Richard Robert Madden, M.D., F.R.C.S.....	444
Christopher Columbus. His Life and His Work.....	661	Missale Romanum.....	671
Compulsory Education.....	220	Mittelalterliche Kirchenfeste und Kalendarien in Bayern.....	222
Conversion of the Tentonic Race.....	000	Nuntiatursberichte Giovanni Morones.....	670
Correct Things for Catholics To Do.....	670	Position of the Church in England and Wales During the Last Two Centuries	900
Darwin and After Darwin.....	667	Pombal. Sein Charakter und seine Politik.....	217
Das Kleid des Herrn auf den Fruechristlichen Denkmaelern.....	222	Psallite Sapienter "Psallite Weise".....	438
Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den Ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche.....	665	Poetical Works of J. C. Heywood. Vol. II. Pater Damien der Held von Molokai, mit Drei Abbildungen und einem Kactechen.....	000
Die XIV. Stationen des Heiligen Kreuzwegs.....	219	Practical Introductory Hebrew Grammar.....	222
Don Gabriel Garcia Moreno, President der Republik Ecuador.....	216	Principles of Political Economy.....	666
Ein Besuch am La Plata.....	221	Phases of Thought and Criticism.....	662
Ein Cyclus Christologischer Gemaelde.....	215	Principles of Political Economy.....	445
Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism of Christian Doctrine.....	221	R. P. Bernardini A. Piccolo Ord. Cap. Conclonatoris.....	436
Explicacion del Catecismo Abreviado de la Doctrina Cristiana.....	223	Reasonableness of the Practices of the Catholic Church.....	447
Exposition of St. Paul's Epistles and of the Catholic Epistles.....	210	Rite of Ordination, according to the Roman Pontifical.....	669
Fasti Mariani.....	670	Ritus Ordinationis Juxta Pontificale Romanum.....	669
Golden Rules for Directing Religious Communities, Seminaries, Colleges, Schools, Families, etc.....	669	Rituale Romanum, Pauli V.....	447
Gregory X. und Rudolf von Habsburg.....	218	Relations of the Church to Society.....	446
Har-Moad; or, The Mountain of the Assembly.....	424	School History for the United States.....	671
History of the Catholic Church in the United States. Vol. IV.....	000	Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church.....	000
History of the Church in England.....	000	Souvenir Sketch of St. Patrick's Church, Philadelphia.....	671
Horæ Diurnæ Brevarii Romanæ.....	671	Songs of Sappho.....	446
Ignaz von Dollinger. Eine Charakteristik ipse, ipsa, ipsum. Which?.....	668	St. Ignatius and the Early Jesuits.....	220
Ireland and St. Patrick.....	000	Spirit of St. Ignatius.....	000
Jesus Christ. Our Saviour's Person, Mission and Spirit.....	441	The Blessed Virgin in the Catacombs.....	671
La Dottrina del Signore.....	211	The Good Christian; or, Sermons on the Chief Christian Virtues.....	220
L'Evangelisation de l'Amerique avant Christophe Colomb.....	206	The State Last.....	432
Lebenslaetter. Erinnerungen aus der Schulzeit.....	216	The Hail Mary; or, Popular Instructions and Considerations on the Angelical Salutation.....	000
Le Capital, La Speculation, Et La Finances Au XIX. Seecle.....	663	Theologia Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum, Auctore Clarissimo Elbel.....	214
Lectures on Slavery and Serfdom in Europe.....	000	Thirty-two Instructions for the Month of May and for the Feast of the Blessed Virgin.....	448
Letters of Archbishop Ullathoroe.....	000	Tom Playfair; or, Making a Start.....	221
Life of Father Hecker.....	208	Theologia Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum.....	448
Life of St. Francis Di Geronimo.....	000	Wisdom and Wit of Blessed Thomas More	447
Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits.....	442	Will of God in Trials, Difficulties and Afflictions.....	218

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—JANUARY, 1892.—No. 65.

NATIONALISM, THE CONCLAVE AND THE NEXT POPE.

FOR a long time past there have been, on both sides of the ocean, on the continent of Europe especially, periodical outbursts of a feverish and most untimely curiosity regarding the nationality of the immediate successor of Leo XIII., regarding the place where the next conclave would be at liberty to assemble, as well as the degree of pressure which the great powers would bring to bear upon the electors, members of the Sacred College.

What is most to be regretted in these discussions, so untimely under present political circumstances, and so indelicate while the Holy Father is so heroically bearing up against the enormous fatigues of his office and the increasing difficulties of his position, is to see Catholics manifesting more anxiety regarding the nationality of the next Pope than the freedom of the conclave, or the conditions of greater liberty or greater servitude awaiting him.

We shall consult the desire of both the Protestant and the Catholic public by giving at once categorical answers to the following questions, which are uppermost in the minds of our readers, and continue to be warmly discussed all over the Christian world:

“Where will the next conclave be held?”

“Of what nationality will be the Pope there chosen?”

“Will the next Pope continue to reside in Rome?”

I.

There is not the faintest likelihood, save in the sole event of a general European war, that the next conclave can or will be held

VOL. XVII.—I

outside of Rome. On the contrary, every probability, every consideration of political wisdom point to the moral certainty that the conclave will take place in the Eternal City, protected from all violence and pressure by the Italian government. The "Law of Guarantees," passed by the Italian Parliament to secure to the Popes freedom in the discharge of their office while continuing to reside in Rome, also promises to protect the Sacred College while performing its functions as an electoral body. Just, then, as it is of the greatest possible interest for the Italian kingdom that none but a native of Italy shall succeed Leo XIII., even so is it the interest of King, Ministers and Parliament to take every possible measure to induce the cardinals to hold the conclave in Rome, and to surround the deliberations of the Electoral College with even greater guarantees of security and freedom from outside pressure or threats of Radical violence, than in February, 1878.

People must not be misled by the action of the Italian Government on the occasion of the disturbances which took place in Rome during the late visit of the French pilgrims, and of the anti-papal demonstrations encouraged or tolerated by the civil authorities throughout the cities of Italy. Persons who have closely studied the politico-religious situation in the Peninsula, and who are also well informed about the sentiments entertained toward the Church and the Holy See by the Great Powers and other European Governments, are well aware that Umberto I. and his cabinet are heartily tired of the daily difficulties and dangers created for the new kingdom by the Piedmontese usurpation, and their continued presence in the City of the Popes. That the sects, —which, like the Furies and Fates of old, pursue the usurpers, fill them with terror, and urge them to commit or to wink at further crimes—would willingly annihilate in Italy the Papacy and every vestige of Catholicism, is what the whole world knows. But swift on this consummation of their designs, or even on the violent expulsion of the Pope and the Curia from Italy, would come the long-wished-for reign of the Radical Revolution, and such a Reign of Terror as would throw into the shade the bloody deeds of Danton and Robespierre, of St. Just and Carrière.

King Umberto and the Marquis di Rudini know this well, and though it may not be any love of the Papacy which impels them to protect the Pope and secure him something like freedom in the discharge of his œcumenical office, they are forced to do so by the instinct of self-preservation. The security of the Pope in the Vatican is the sole pledge of the existence in the Quirinal of the Savoyard Dynasty.

Now let us see on what grounds rests the certainty that Italy will protect the next meeting of the conclave in Rome.

Immediately after the death of Pius IX. it became, among the thirty-eight cardinals present in Rome, a subject of earnest inquiry as to whether the conclave should be held in Rome or not. Pius IX. had left behind him a decree authorizing the Sacred College to depart from the constitutions of his predecessors, to hold the conclave wherever, under the circumstances, they would be assured of perfect liberty, and to deviate as well from other formalities in so far as such deviation was needful. In a first meeting of the thirty-eight cardinals, and acting under the fear of violence or disturbance from the outside if they held the election in Rome, thirty of their number voted to hold the conclave outside of Rome or of Italy, only eight declaring in favor of Rome. All this, however, was done in ignorance of the accord to which Italy and the powers had come to secure the full liberty of the conclave if held in Rome. The majority inclined, with Cardinal Franchi, who had been formerly Nuncio at Madrid, to hold the conclave in Spain. The Spanish ambassador, informed of this resolution, at once told Cardinal Franchi that the Spanish government declined to give the cardinals hospitality. Cardinal Manning, who had voted with the majority, nevertheless openly told such of them as wished to hold the conclave in Malta, that he had no reason to believe that the Governor of that island would or could grant them the desired permission. So the next day, finding that they could not count on any of the European governments in this emergency, and reassured by the discourse of the Sub-Dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal di Pietro, who presided at their deliberations, and who was in the confidence of the Cabinet of the Quirinal, the cardinals changed their votes, and a formal secret ballot having taken place, all but five voted to hold the conclave in Rome.

It is now a well known fact, that if the Sacred College had decided to go outside of Italy for the conclave, the Italian government had given orders to escort them in safety, and with all the honors due to their station, to the frontiers of the kingdom. Had they determined to meet in conclave in any other city of Italy but Rome, the government had instructed the civil and military authorities everywhere to secure their deliberations against every possible disturbance. At the same time, however, it was the fixed resolve of the King and his Ministers to take possession of the Vatican the very moment the cardinals would have left Rome. This determination had been communicated to Cardinal di Pietro.

The government of King Umberto hold themselves pledged to the Cabinets of Europe, to the Catholic courts in particular, to make it more than ever perfectly safe for the Papal Electors to meet in Rome after the death of the present Pope. More than ever will it be the policy of the Quirinal to prove to the world

that the conclave shall enjoy greater liberty under the flag of Savoy, than when Rome, at the death of the last Pope, was turned by the Catholic powers into a hot-bed of intrigue, and all manner of moral pressure was brought to bear by the courts on their respective cardinals.

Ever since the election of Leo XIII. the Italian government and its apologists have pointed with justifiable pride to the conclave which elected him as contrasting most favorably with all similar assemblies in the past, and as a precedent which the new kingdom is disposed to follow in the future. Assuredly it is their interest to fulfil the pledge thus given and the expectations of the Catholic world founded upon it. No less sure is it that any effective attempt of the Sacred College to hold a conclave outside of Italy will be the signal for the troops of King Umberto to enter the Vatican and to hang the Italian tricolor from the Papal apartments and St. Peter's.

These are considerations which the members of the Sacred College, venerable as they are for their enlightened wisdom, their long experience in dealing with the highest interests of the Church, and their tried love and fidelity to the cause of Christ, will not fail to weigh well in the balance of the sanctuary.

As we are about to conclude this article (October 22, 1891), the *New York Herald* brings us from Rome the intelligence that in consequence of the violent demonstrations against the Pope, which occurred on the occasion of the late French pilgrimages, the cardinals are again deliberating about the necessity of leaving Rome at once, and "about the locality of the next conclave, and whether the Pope should take steps to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Quirinal. No decision was arrived at. The Italian government has assured the Pope that nothing should occur to disturb the tranquillity of the Holy See, but that it must be understood that there was no intention to modify the law of guarantees."

Whether the Holy Father does or not contemplate seriously the necessity of leaving Rome; whether the Sacred College has been asked to deliberate on the safest place to hold the next conclave, and whether any advances toward a *modus vivendi* have been authorized or made to the Cabinet of the Quirinal, are facts which we have at present no means of verifying. That in the very first days of his Pontificate, Leo XIII. summoned Cesare Cantu to Rome to concert with Cardinal Franchi a *modus vivendi* between the Pontifical and the Italian governments, is a fact for which the writer of this paper has the authority of the venerable author of *La Storia Universale*. In a letter dictated from his sick-bed in 1882 and directed to the writer, then at Vigo, Cantu relates how overjoyed he was to answer the Pope's summons, and how every-

thing promised fairly for this first attempt at conciliation, when Cardinal Franchi suddenly died. Cardinal Nina, who succeeded him as Secretary of State, was of a different way of thinking, and so the Pope did not pursue his purpose. Is it possible that Leo XIII. contemplates, after well-nigh fourteen years of conflict with the Revolutionary forces enthroned at Rome, to seek, once for all, what he deemed necessary when first raised to the Chair of Peter?

Be that as it may, the Italian government is only complying with a political necessity and the dictates of a true statesmanlike wisdom, when it repeats to the Vatican the assurance that the Pontifical government shall be protected from revolutionary violence and that the Law of Guarantees shall remain unchanged.

We are only recalling these assurances here to show that the present masters of Rome are not willing that the Pope should seek an asylum outside of Italy, or that the Sacred College should entertain the thought of holding a conclave anywhere else than in the palace of the Popes. That the king and his ministers are not sorry to frighten away from Rome these imposing crowds of French pilgrims, or to allow the anti-clerical clubs of Rome to show the Pope and the cardinals what religion might expect, if the strong hand of the government were paralyzed or withdrawn—this conduct would be consistent with the past. It is a part of the Piedmontese policy to force the Holy Father to conciliate and to effect a *modus vivendi*.

But so long as there is no European war arraying France against Italy, so long as Italy is left in peace to rule Rome as she now does, it may be regarded as an inviolable rule of Italian state policy that no pains shall be spared to protect the Papal electors while choosing a new Pope, and to surround the latter with the safeguards stipulated in the Law of Guarantees. The last conclave was protected by the Depretis-Crispi ministry. The Parliamentary party represented by the Marquis de Rudini could not be less earnest in their desire to carry out the law faithfully.

We have said that a European war might render the stay of the Pope in Rome so unsafe as to justify, in the opinion of his counsellors, or to necessitate his abandoning the Eternal City, and asking a temporary asylum from some friendly power. Even then such a step would only be advisable, when the Italian government had declared to the Vatican that it could not guarantee the Holy Father's safety or that of the cardinals against the tide of Radical passions and masonic hatred let loose by war. Then it would be the policy as well as the interest and duty of the Quirinal to help provide the Pope with a safe retreat while the war lasted, to use its kind offices for that purpose with a friendly country; to

prevent the Vatican and St. Peter's, as well as the Pontifical palaces, etc., from falling into the hands of the mob. We are thus dealing with a position in which King Umberto and his government were yielding to the resistless force of circumstances, facilitating the stay abroad of the Papal government, and looking forward to the time when they might safely encourage its return to Rome.

This is taking what many will judge to be an optimistic view of an extreme situation and of the disposition of the rulers of Rome and Italy. But there is the other view, with its near probabilities, and the fearful realities it suggests, that in which we suppose the anti-clerical clubs throughout the Italian Peninsula to be the controlling force there while a European war lasted.

II.

The same weighty considerations which compel all serious-minded men, all Catholics who set the good of the Church above national feelings and preferences, to see that there can be, as things are at present, no question of holding a conclave outside of Rome and the palace of the Vatican, must also lead them to the conclusion that the next Pope should be, like the present Holy Father, a native of Italy. It is strange to read in the great daily organs of public opinion here as well as in Europe, the speculations which the editors and their correspondents indulge in with regard to the nationality of Leo XIII.'s immediate successor. The public mind, on the European Continent particularly has been long preoccupied with prophecies on this untoward subject; so much so, indeed, that one of the foremost publicists in Italy, R. di Cesare, printed in 1888 a large octavo volume of 623 pages, containing a history of the conclave which elected Leo XIII., and a pamphlet in nine chapters on the next conclave. This remarkably clever book has afforded to the speculators of the press a seemingly exhaustless theme. Catholic writers, like numberless others, have kept up the excitement by foretelling the election of a French or German Pope, of an English or an American Pope, and by seeing or pretending to see in such a choice, an earnest of the restoration of the Pope's temporal sovereignty. The names of the cardinals thus likely to be elected were and are still repeatedly mentioned. And no reader of these oracular announcements can be more astonished at their extravagance than the eminent prelates thus unwarrantably singled out for the most unenviable of distinctions.

Save only in the case mentioned above, when, during a European war, the conclave would assemble outside of Italy, could the electors have any motive to choose a Pope not an Italian, as a compliment to the country affording them hospitality. But on

weighing all the reasons which must influence the votes of the Sacred College, reasons of general and permanent ecclesiastical policy, not of passing and local expediency, one is forced to come back to the belief that the rule governing Papal elections will prevail—and none but an Italian Pope shall fill the seat left vacant by the Thirteenth Leo.

We are now assuming that the next conclave will be held in Rome, and that the Italian government will keep to their solemn pledges of protecting the electors. We are also assuming that the election will take place while Europe is enjoying peace. Now, to arrive at a just conclusion as to the wishes of the great powers regarding the nationality of Leo XIII.'s successor, let us examine the officially expressed wishes of these same powers before the conclave of February, 1878.

The sole anxiety of the Piedmontese government, after pledging themselves to secure the freedom of the Electoral College, was to obtain, in return, an Italian Pope, and, if possible, one of a conciliatory temper.¹ This anxiety was shared by all the Continental governments. Before the death of Pius IX., and on December 8, 1877, the Italian minister at the Court of Madrid writes to his government in Rome: "In my last conversation with Señor Silvela (the Spanish Minister of State), after dwelling for some time on the health of Pius IX., the discourse naturally turned to the next conclave, and on the attitude to be taken up on this occasion by the great powers. With regard to this subject the Minister of State expressed himself in these terms: "Spain wishes, and it entertains no doubt of it, that the conclave should be held in Rome with the greatest security and freedom; and it hopes that the choice of a successor to Pius IX. will fall upon a person disposed towards conciliation, and of temperate sentiments. Instructions in this sense were sent to the two representatives of Spain in Rome." ²

In answer to this expressed hope of the Spanish court the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Melegari, writes on December 18th: "You can convince Señor Silvela that the Italian government believes itself able to secure to the conclave full liberty, not only against any of the manifestations or disorders which have taken place more than once on such occasions, but against every species of influence or pressure from the outside The government is perfectly conscious of the obligation incumbent on it of securing to the Sacred College all liberty to meet and deliberate; but it is also conscious of the very great facility which the condi-

¹ *Il Conclave di Leone XIII.*, by R. di Cesare, 3d ed., pp. 299, and following.

² *Ibidem.*

tion of the public mind in Italy, and especially in Rome, will afford (the conclave) toward accomplishing its purpose."¹

Marshal MacMahon, who was then President of the French Republic, seeing that the Radicals—that is, the anti-Christian Masonic sects—were daily acquiring more power in the cabinets of the Quirinal and the Tuilleries, was very much concerned about the next conclave. "M. Waddington assured me," writes General Cialdini, "that both he and his colleagues are quite anxious to calm the scruples of the marshal's conscience by obtaining for him the certainty that the king's government will respect, and make others respect, the liberty of the coming conclave, and that they will watch jealously over its perfect safety. The minister said repeatedly, and with great insistence, that he would be exceedingly grateful to me if I could obtain from the king's government a new and explicit declaration in this sense. He also expressed the wish to know whether the government of His Majesty had any reasons going to show or to found the presumption that any Jesuitical or ultra-montane influences are at work directing things so that the conclave would have to be held outside of Rome, and if in this case the government knew in what place these influences would induce the conclave to assemble." The desired pledge regarding the will and ability of the Italian government to secure the conclave's full liberty in Rome having been at once given the French cabinet, the latter forthwith replied: "France desires that the conclave shall meet in Rome, and that the election of a new Pope shall be effected in the freest manner, in the forms most regular and most in conformity with the traditional usages, in order that under no circumstances whatever the validity of the new election may be questioned. The French government, moreover, desires that the new Pope should be a man of moderate sentiments, who will make a reconciliation with Italy possible, and he must be an Italian. Our influence, within the limits of what is possible, shall be exercised in this direction. I could not," the French minister goes on to say, "pronounce here the name of any one individual, but it seems to me that after a long pontificate, like that of Pius IX., the conclave will be naturally disposed to elevate to the papal chair a man of advanced years. I do not yet know within what limits we might practically make use of our right of exclusion, nor do I conceal from myself the difficulty of upholding such a right. But I believe that in certain cases we should not hesitate to claim it—in the case, for instance, where we should perceive there was danger of raising to the pontificate one who was not an Italian. I have already had occasion to speak of the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

future conclave to the representatives of the other Catholic powers, particularly with those of Spain and Austria, and I ascertained to my satisfaction that they agree with us in our wishes regarding the place to hold the next conclave, as well as with regard to the nationality of the future Pope.”¹

After the death of Pius IX. the Italian government addressed to its representatives abroad assurances that the promises made regarding the security of the Sacred College and the freedom of the conclave were being loyally fulfilled.

The cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg, then violently persecuting the Catholics of Germany and Russia, were also questioned by the Italian ambassadors about the conclave and the person of the future Pope. The sovereigns in both empires, as well as their ministers, expressed the desire to have a Pope of moderate temper and a conciliatory disposition, who would not hinder them in their endeavors to perfect the enslavement of the church throughout their dominions. The will of the autocrat in Russia, the tyrannical decrees of the imperial parliament and the Prussian legislature in Germany, “were the laws of the realm,” the persecutors said. Russia and Prussia did not wish to persecute their Catholic subjects; they only “demanded obedience to the laws of the land!” So they put the case.

So does the Italian government speak in 1891 of the series of oppressive, persecuting, unnecessary and most impolitic legislative enactments which have swept away, since the election of Leo XIII., almost every remnant of ecclesiastical property, every vestige of ecclesiastical immunity and freedom.

They are the laws of the kingdom, and must be rigorously executed. They must be observed by all, as if they were made to secure the most sacred rights of the Church, instead of openly aiming to extinguish within her bosom all the sources of Christian spirit and Catholic life.

But whether the statesmen and politicians represented by the Marquis di Rudini are disposed or permitted to carry out a policy of conciliation, justice or restitution toward the Holy See, or whether Crispi returns to power and the Italian radicals again have it all their own way in the parliament and in the government, certain it is that it becomes more than ever a necessity of the Italian situation to secure the election of an Italian Pope in the next conclave. There is no earthly reason why France, the only one of the powers possibly disposed to thwart Italy in this respect, should desire that the next Pope should be other than an Italian.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 302, 303; from the letter of December 25, 1877, addressed to the Italian minister by Signor Resselmann, Italian Chargé d’Affairs in Paris.

Unless France were able and willing to elect by her own influence a French Pope, to restore in his favor the civil principality of the papacy, and to uphold it by a permanent armed force, there is no likelihood that a Frenchman in our day and generation shall ascend the papal throne.

The present political outlook in Europe is such that, even in the event of a general war the issue would not so depress the power of Italy or exalt that of her neighbor across the Alps, as to leave the latter mistress of the peninsula and the Mediterranean or the armed protectress of the restored principality of the Popes.

III.

Italy, then, is quite safe in counting on an unbroken line of Italian pontiffs for this generation.

We have now come to the last of the three questions we purposed to answer: "Will the next Pope continue to reside in Rome?" What we have to say will serve, more even than what we have yet said, to convince the unprejudiced mind that the Popes should be natives of Italy, and that they should reside in Rome.

People who may take exception to this can never have been in Rome or studied attentively the constitution of the Catholic Church and the working in the centre of catholicity of that stupendous mechanism, the administration of a spiritual society having two hundred and twenty millions of subjects belonging to every race, nation and tribe under the sun, spread over every part of the habitable globe, and living under every known form of polity and government.

The Roman Catholic Church—that is, this spiritual empire of two hundred and twenty millions of human beings—claims to be the only true Church of Christ, of which the Pope is sole visible head on earth, Christ's vicar; shepherd, under Him, of both pastors and peoples—their teacher and guide in all things pertaining to salvation.

The Vicar of Christ is, by a special decree of Providence, Bishop of Rome as well as Bishop of bishops. Rome has been the residence of the Popes, the home of the papacy, the moral centre of Christendom, the capital of that vast spiritual empire, the Church, ever since the year 42 after Christ, when St. Peter came thither to govern, from that centre of empire, the entire flock committed to him by the Divine Shepherd, and there to die a bloody death in their defence and in testimony to the faith that was in him. There the successors of Peter have since continued to live, to teach, to govern, to suffer a long life of martyrdom down to Leo XIII., the two hundred and sixty-third in that glorious line of Pontiffs reach-

ing back to the fisherman of Galilee, whose body reposes in death in the catacombs of Nero, beneath the dome of the Vatican.

In Rome has Peter, ever-living in the person of each successive Pontiff, governed, taught, enlightened the Christian world, imprisoned often, martyred, exiled, persecuted, and ever triumphing in these stricken shepherds over persecutions, schisms, and heresies, over the hostile might of emperors and the fierce passions of the popular multitude, over the destruction wrought by successive hordes of barbarians, and the anti-Christian policy of a later civilization.

Condemned for two hundred years to worship, for the most part, in the Roman catacombs with their persecuted flock, the bishops of Rome only emerged into liberty and the light of day to see the magnificent Rome of the Cæsars fall a prey to Goth and Vandal. From out the ruins accumulated on the seven-hilled city and her immediate territory, the Pontiffs built up Christian Rome, gathered within the shelter of these ruins what the sword had spared of the Roman people, fostered them, protected them against Lombard and Greek, till gratitude for such loving guardianship, extended to generation after generation, induced the Roman people to look up to the Roman Pontiff as their temporal prince as well as their bishop. And then the new Christendom, which the Popes had created by their unwearied apostleship, ratified this pact of filial love and national gratitude, and the Popes became kings of Rome—their Royalty the head and crown of the entire social system in the Europe of our forefathers.

Papal, Christian Rome, was thus the home of the Common Father. There was the tomb of Peter; and by the side of Peter in the Vatican they had, in due time, laid the remains of his brother Apostle, Paul. These two had toiled together for a quarter of a century to lay deep and wide the foundations of that Church of Rome, "the Mother and Teacher of Churches"; they consecrated it with their blood on the same day, when the sword of Nero beheaded Paul on the road to Ostia, and his ferocious hatred condemned Peter to be crucified within view of the imperial palace on the Vatican.

The shrine of these brother Apostles in St. Peter's, and by the side of the Vatican palace, the prison-home of Leo XIII., is, in the nineteenth century, what it has been for so many ages, the very centre of Catholicity. Thither our forefathers were wont to resort as pilgrims; thither we, Catholics of every nationality and clime, still love to resort for our soul's comfort. Thither kings and queens from England, Ireland, Scotland, from the fair land of France, from martial Germany, from the East as well as from the West, came to the feet of the Common Father, to lay down their souls'

burthen, and to return, their hearts aflame with new ardor in Christ's cause, and for the benefit of their peoples.

Rome was the abode of him whom all nations called Parent. What wonder that princes, as well as their subjects, loved to find there, in life or in death, in good- or ill-fortune, a sure home and a resting-place. Discrowned royalty, in our own day, as in the past, though banned from every other realm, was sure of an asylum in Rome, although the refugees, in the days of their omnipotence, had been the worst enemies of the Church and the Pope. • On the very spot where Peter was crucified, in the Church of Monte-Citorio, are the tombs of our exiled Princes, O'Neill and O'Donnell, while on entering St. Peter's the first tomb you meet is that of the last of the exiled Stuarts.

The Popes asked not of the unfortunates, who sought a refuge within the city of the Holy Apostles, what crimes or what virtues had drawn on them their ill fate. It sufficed that they were fallen, and needed what the political world never gives—forgiveness, forgetfulness, and peace.

Who dares to say, in the face of all past history, that they only came to Rome to plot and conspire, and to turn the hospitality of the Popes into an opportunity to prepare new revolutions?

But, that the Rome of the Popes was the loved resort of all Christians, and the secure retreat of the fallen and the unfortunate, is but the least of its merits.

It was the great central nursery of the apostolic spirit, the ever-flowing well-spring of sanctity and highest learning for the entire Church. It was the seat of that mighty system of church-government which extended its solicitude to every point of the globe, and brought every soul needing spiritual relief within reach of the hand, the ear, and the heart of Christ's vicar.

The Bishop of Rome has not only to care for the wants of his own flock within the Eternal City, and to see that the bishops of Italy fulfil faithfully the duties of their own charge; he has to render an account to the Eternal Prince of Pastors for every diocese in the Church Universal. More than that, the Bishop of Rome, because he is Christ's Vicar, and the Shepherd of shepherds here below, is bound by his office to exert himself to the utmost to bring within Christ's fold every tribe of earth, every child of the human race, since Christ died for all, and all are called to the possession of His everlasting inheritance.

If you could have had the good fortune to visit Rome, or to live a short time in it, before it fell into the power of its present rulers, you must have seen, after a first brief survey, that it resembled no other city in any civilized land. You might, even then, have heard some Protestant traveller ask, what use the Pope could possibly have for

so many palaces, so many immense institutions of beneficence and education? Where was the need, where the use of these hundreds of churches, of these splendid basilicas, inside and outside the walls of Rome, which remained empty and solitary, save on some rare feast days, throughout the year? What useful purpose could be served by these countless monasteries and convents, and all this bewildering variety of monks and nuns one passed continually in the streets? Then, there were these flocks of students, vested in black and white, in scarlet and purple, and the colleges belonging to various nationalities. Could not these young men be educated to better advantage at home in their respective countries, than beneath the fervid sun and in the malarious climate of Rome? So people queried; and not a few Catholics shared their wonder and their ignorance of the necessity and the marvelous propriety of things.

Have you reflected that the various departments of this vast ecclesiastical administration require offices of such extent as almost to form, with their buildings and their occupants, a city in themselves? Only think of what is comprised in the sole department concerned with the duties of the active Apostolate of the Holy See, the Propaganda, with its colleges, its library, its records, its printing presses issuing works in all civilized, and in so many uncivilized, languages, for the use of its missionaries and their converts,—think of what this great institution implies of gigantic labor, of world-wide enterprise. And yet, while its buildings are far too narrow for their purpose, while the revenues devoted by the economies and generosity of successive Popes and cardinals have been seized upon and cut down one-half by the present rulers of Christian Rome,—the needs of the Propaganda are daily increasing twofold and threefold, thanks to the fresh impulse given by Leo XIII. especially, and his two immediate predecessors to the divine work of spreading the Gospel among the heathen of both hemispheres. Already the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda has had to divide its work between the two standing committees of cardinals, with their prelate-consultors and inferior officers,—all carefully selected for distinguished scholarship and experience. One of these, of recent creation, is devoted to the Oriental Churches, their missions, ritual, literature, and all the priceless interests attached to their present condition and their promising future. The other committee of Propaganda continues to extend its care to the Catholic Churches of the Old World and the New, of Australia and Oceanica, where missionary zeal is striving to build up the edifice of religion in the divine form and the solid conditions intended by the Master.

The Propaganda is still a new wonder and a theme of enthusiastic praise to non-Catholic scholars visiting Rome. It is, how-

ever, only one among the many no less marvellous and necessary creations of the Bishops of Rome.

Next to the congregation *de Propaganda Fide* on which the Supreme Pastor devolves the principal share of his solicitude and authority,—there are the great monastic orders, the authorized religious societies of both sexes, which have their mother houses in Rome. These bodies are the efficient and God sent auxiliary forces which have grown up spontaneously in Rome and all over the Christian world, under the creative breath of the spirit of God, the spirit of Holiness, to aid the secular missionary clergy in their apostleship in pagan and heretical countries, and most powerfully help also in the home field of the Church toward reviving and maintaining the realized ideal of the supernatural life taught in the Gospel. We here in America have only to recall who were the men whom the Popes first, and the Congregation of Propaganda, later, sent to evangelize the native tribes of our great Continent. Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, Augustinians, were the advance guard of that army of Apostles from the light of whose lives the indigenous American races learned to know Christ and His Gospel, to love Him, and to follow Him.

Around the chair of Peter, around the tomb where the hearts of the martyred Peter and Paul, still live and throb in their ashes, have sprung up under the breath of the Spirit, as naturally as the grass grows and the flowers bud forth in spring-tide, these monastic orders, these great religious families of men and women whose profession and whose lives shadow forth everlastingly the divine, the supernatural virtues mirrored in the lives of Christ and His Blessed Mother.

It was but natural that the bishop of Rome, the shepherd of the whole flock, the undying Apostle bound to care for the salvation of the entire race of man in every point of space and time, should have in his home, in the seat of his supreme solicitude and apostolate, these monasteries and convents, the nurseries of that heavenly spirit, which is the very soul of Christianity, that from their garden he might transplant the choicest shoots to every clime. These houses where self-denial, and self-sacrifice forever live, where the love of Christ and the love of His redeemed is as deep as the ocean and as high as the heavens,—are the springs of living waters which flow from the City of God all over the earth, and are now making the desert places of Africa, Asia, America, and Australia bloom like the Garden of God and give forth the sweet odor of Christ.

Such are the monasteries, the convents, the religious houses of Rome.

But the Vicar of Christ must have in the city of the Holy Apos-

tles nurseries of science for the whole Church, even as he is bound to have nurseries of sanctity.

Even before the love and veneration of Christendom had placed on the brow of the successor St. Peter the crown of his threefold royalty,—the Popes had in their palace at the Lateran a school where the best masters taught all the sciences then known. When the civil principality of the Popes had become the centre of the social order of Christendom, what empire, what kingdom did, in proportion to its means, as much for science as did Rome and the States of the Church? With revenues far inferior to those of the city of New York, what did not the enlightened patronage of the Popes achieve for learning and for Christian art?

We mention art here, because Christian art was born in the sanctuary, and its glory must fade and depart from the land with the divine religion from whose radiance it sprang. We need only make this passing allusion here to one of the glories of the Papacy and pass on.

One reflection must, however, not be overlooked. We may be tempted to repeat the question so often asked by the superficial traveler or reader,—“why should Catholic nations have special colleges in Rome for the education of the elite of their priesthood?” We might as well ask,—“why do the foremost nations in Europe send their most promising students in architecture, painting, and sculpture to perfect themselves in Rome?” To the latter query we reply,—“because nowhere else in the world can one find perpetuated the best traditions of art, or find for study and imitation such incomparable masterpieces. And this, too, is due to the enlightened liberality of the bishops of Rome.”

In answer to the former query we say: In Rome alone are found the living traditions of the purest, the highest, and the most indispensable ecclesiastical science. There the best masters in theology, in Biblical knowledge and the languages and sciences which shed a light upon the Scriptures, have been ever generously supported by the Popes. In Rome, ever since the decadence of the law schools of Bologna and Paris, has canon law, the living law of the Church in her practice and administration, been taught with that regard to the theory and to practice, to be found only where the law courts of the universal church daily issue their decrees and their opinions. From Rome the young men thus educated at the fountain head return to their respective dioceses to teach in their turn the pure unadulterated doctrine as learned at the feet of the *Mater and Magistra Ecclesiarum Orbis*.

Thus do the Bishops of Rome provide in their episcopal city not only for the needs of the apostleship among the heathen and the faithful alike, but for the perpetuation and growth of sanctity and science and all the natural and supernatural plants which

bloom in God's garden beneath the shade of these two twin Trees of Life.

There are other papal institutions, other departments of this administration of the Catholic Church as a body spread over the whole earth, which we must now mention in order. We have said nothing of the Roman Chancery, of the Dataria, of the various congregations of cardinals to which are referred the cases of private appeal and public interest daily and hourly arriving from every country. Those appeals involve the most sacred interests and the most secret concerns of the conscience, and the poorest, the lowliest, the most distant member of Christ's wide flock has an inviolable right to come to Christ's vicar for light, for counsel, for healing; and no appeal is dismissed without hearing. It is still the word of St. Paul which guides the Supreme Pastor in his dealings with individuals: *Quis infirmatur et ego non infirmor?* "What soul is sick that I am not sick with it?" There are matrimonial causes involving the honor and the peace of families. There are disputes between pastors and their flocks, between priests and their bishops, between bishops themselves on questions of right and jurisdiction—questions involving the interests of a whole ecclesiastical province, questions between the civil governments and the Church, questions regarding the religious orders among themselves or in relation to the secular clergy, questions on the solution of which depend the peace of a kingdom or an empire.

All these have to be put on record, as well as the judgments pronounced upon them. Imagine the immensity of these records after so many centuries, imagine the still greater magnitude of the public and private interests attached to their faithful preservation, and then think seriously of the incomparable anxiety with which the entire Catholic world contemplates, as at the present moment, the possibility of these records falling into the hands of the enemies of the Church! In this enumeration I have omitted the department of the Secretary of State, with its vast correspondence and its historical treasures.

But let us not be at present distracted by the thought of such a catastrophe from our true object, the study of *what it is to be bishop of Rome*, and why it is impossible to contemplate, under the ordinary providence of God, the city of Rome as not belonging to the Pope, and all these institutions, these records, these written annals of eighteen hundred years of the outward and inward life of the greatest society the world has known, as being ruthlessly annihilated or swept away from the possession and custody of Christ's Vicar?

Do my readers, whether Protestant or Catholic, after following my argument thus far, now perceive *why it is that the Bishop of Rome should reside in Rome?* how many sacred and imprescriptible titles

he has to the city of Rome? why it is that he should have in Rome neither master nor rival in the sovereignty consecrated by a possession of more than a thousand years, and by services to Rome and to Italy as incomparable as they are indisputable?

If what we have said be true and convincing, then it must be evident that the Bishop of Rome, except in rare and most extraordinary cases, should be a native of Italy, educated in Rome and long familiarized with the working of that great and unique administrative mechanism necessary to the regular government of the Universal Church.

The same reasons which compel all unbiased intellects to admit that the Bishop of Rome should be an Italian must also force upon them the conclusion that the Pope should reside in Rome.

The whole of Christendom—indeed, the whole civilized world—is deeply, vitally interested in maintaining the Pontiffs in possession of their episcopal city, in the undisturbed and uninterrupted government of the Church from this, its natural, its providentially appointed centre.

The safety, the preservation of the records of the Holy See in all the complexity we have rapidly described is a matter of household, of personal concern to the Catholics of every nation, nay, to non-Catholics themselves, who know what historical treasures would be imperiled or destroyed, especially in the present temper of the Italian revolutionists, by the forced exile of the Pope and the College of Cardinals. We say nothing of the art treasures gathered during so many centuries by the diligent liberality of the Roman court.

Four times within the century have the Vatican, the Quirinal, with the other apostolic palaces and the offices of the ecclesiastical administration fallen into the hands of the enemies of the Church. Each time the records were pillaged of whatever struck the fancy, attracted the cupidity or wounded the sectarian and national sentiments of the despoilers. Much was destroyed which no money could purchase and no industry restore, much more was scattered by the brigands throughout the capitals of Europe. The damage thus done is irreparable.

But the loss to science and to art which would be certain in the fierce excitement now prevailing in Italy, to follow the flight of the Holy Father and his court could not be compared to the immense moral mischief consequent upon the disturbance caused in the government of the Church.

Meanwhile it behooves Leo. XIII. to show what the successor of the apostles can do to defend the rights and interests of which he is the sworn guardian. A disarmed Pope, forsaken by the powers and peoples of Christendom, and having to face in Rome a revolutionary and usurping government and the Masonic power,

which urges it to resort to the most violent extremities, can only say to those who ask him to give up the sacred trust confided to him, *non possumus*, "we cannot."¹ Popes have died ere now in defence of their flock and rather than betray the divine interests of souls.

A Pope may gloriously die in asserting his right to Rome, both as his own particular Episcopal See, as the natural and traditional seat of government of the Universal Church, as the seat, too, of that temporal sovereignty created for him by Catholic Christendom. That sovereignty is the guaranty and bulwark of the Pontiff's independence and freedom in the discharge of his office as Supreme Pastor.

It may well be that the day has come when the Bishops of Rome must shed their blood in order to vindicate their indefeasible right to this sovereignty. If, in the ordinary course of Providence, and when the care of the Roman Pontiffs embrace 220,000,000 souls all over the globe, it be more than ever absolutely necessary that they should be free, in the discharge of their office, from the dictation and control of any earthly power and master, then a temporal sovereignty is a necessary means to such an end. And where but in Rome should be the seat of this sovereignty?

Has the fulness of time come to assert this truth and vindicate the right to such liberty, by laying down one's life? Perhaps Christ now demands of His Vicar to say to the nations that he is ready to die rather than give up the city of Rome to any human power or to the declared enemies of the Church and her Founder. Perhaps the further consecration of a martyr's blood, shed to protect the Chair of Peter, is needed to open the eyes of Christendom, and to touch the heart of the Italian people, apparently forgetful of what they owe to the long line of the Bishops of Rome.

It is a moving spectacle, at the close of this nineteenth century of the life of the Christian Church, to see Leo XIII., the 263d Bishop of Rome, braving the anticlerical clubs, the threats of assassination, and the cowardly connivance of the Quirinal, rather than yield to the pretensions of the latter or the threats of the former.

Leo XIII. is a singular and happy compound of moderation, invincible firmness and child-like conscientiousness. We know he will not quail or yield, or give up Rome and his flock to the wolves. The Cardinals are also sworn to defend to the death the sacred interests of the Roman Church. The scarlet robes they wear are to remind them that they should be ready to shed their blood in so holy a cause. The eyes of the whole world are now on them.

Rome is the city of martyrs. On every one of the Seven

¹ Acts iv. 20: "WE CANNOT but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

Hills are monuments reared to commemorate the death of Christ's glorious witnesses. In the Mamertine Prison they show you the pillar to which Peter was chained before being led out to crucifixion. All around the adjoining Forum are the ruins of the Basilicas or Imperial Courts, in which Popes, priests, senators and noble ladies, men and women of every degree, were called to answer for the faith that was in them, tortured to compel them to abjure the name of Christ, and finally handed over to the executioner. In the ruined Coliseum towering near the Forum, Christians, men, women and children, were exposed to the wild beasts to vary the sports of a Roman populace. The floor of this vast amphitheatre was all soaked in the blood of martyrs. Christian ages were wont to consider it as a holy place. There Christian Rome had ever been wont to assemble to perform the devotions of Christ's Passion, adoring the Divine King of Martyrs where so many had borne him heroic witness by the shedding of their blood. What though the present rulers of Rome have desecrated this glorious shrine of Christian heroism, torn down the cross from its walls and the emblems of Christ's suffering from the area beneath? Vandalism cannot blot out the consecration which clings to the stones above and around, and to the very earth beneath. We pilgrims from the New World kneel still on that bare earth and kiss the foot-prints left there by that glorious disciple of St. John the Apostle, Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and martyr.

All Rome, within her walls and outside in her Catacombs, is hallowed soil; our hearts, our souls cling to its very ruins. Surely neither Pope nor cardinals will give up this treasure-house of all that is most holy and most dear to us, to the sacrilegious hands ready to desecrate, to despoil, to destroy.

Whatever the press of Europe and America may publish to the contrary, we refuse to credit what is last reported of the Italian government. They cannot have adopted the suicidal policy of urging, counselling or countenancing the departure from Rome of the Pope and the cardinals. We cannot conceive that Austria, Hungary, Germany, France, or even Great Britain, would fail to remonstrate with such a mad resolve of the Italian Cabinet, or hesitate to use their influence both with the Holy Father and King Umberto, to dissuade them from a course of action so fatal to both.

As for us, we know Leo XIII. too well to believe for one moment that he has ever seriously entertained the resolution of abandoning Rome. He is one who can die like a soldier at his post. He is not a coward to run away, and mask faint-heartedness under the name of prudence.

With him in the hour of his distress and dire need are our hearts, our prayers, our veneration and our undying devotion.

BERNARD O'REILLY, D.D.

CONSCIOUS ACTS.

MUCH has been written, in recent years, on the subject of consciousness. Conflicting theories are proposed for explaining this action of man's intellect, some of them more or less materialistic, some based on peculiar principles of false mental philosophy, and not a few of such speculations helping to render its nature quite obscure to many minds. Without here stating or discussing the various opinions that have been defended, the attempt will be made in this article to define and describe the intellectual action styled consciousness, just as it is made known to us on the testimony of that consciousness itself. This may be of some use, since no one who fails rightly to understand this intellectual operation, can attain to any full and precise knowledge of psychology. There is some repetition in what follows, because of the same matter being proposed under different aspects, in order to render the subject of consciousness, which of its nature is difficult, more clear and intelligible to the general reader.

Consciousness is that knowledge which the intellect has of itself; and which consists in the intellect knowing itself, knowing its own acts as its own, and knowing that it knows. The intellect as capable of thus knowing itself and its acts as its own, is often styled, in popular language, the power or faculty of consciousness; yet, consciousness is not a faculty distinct from the intellect itself.

The intellect is distinguished as directly conscious, and reflexly conscious; and it is necessary to understand the two operations clearly in order to comprehend the nature of consciousness, as well as the intellect's natural manner of knowing any of its objects.

The intellect as directly conscious, has knowledge of itself jointly with its knowledge of an object, of what affects itself or is in itself. Hence the name given to this accompanying self-knowledge in the intellect, *consciousness*,¹ derived from *conscire*, which signifies to know along with, together with, jointly with. The human intellect cannot know itself directly, except along with something else which is perceived by means of an actual idea; but the intellect thus directly conscious of itself does not then form any separate idea of itself.

¹ "Conscientia," is defined in the dictionaries, "joint knowledge;" see Andrews, the *Century Dictionary*, Oxford translation of Aristotle. St. Thomas, p. I qu. 79, a. 13, in C, says, "*conscientia dicitur cum alio scientia*;" and in another place, "*conscire dicitur quasi simul scire*," consciousness is essential to intellectual knowledge; it is an intrinsic constituent of such knowledge.

In knowing self as an object, reflexly or by introspection, the intellect forms its idea of self just as it forms its idea in knowing any other object.¹ Along with this act of knowing itself reflexly by means of an idea of self formed for that end, the intellect has, at the same time, its accompanying *direct* consciousness of self. Indeed, it is only by direct consciousness that it knows itself as present, and as acting or knowing, and reflex knowledge of self as an object, is not possible, unless accompanied with direct consciousness.

The mind knows itself directly, then ; not, however, by distinguishing² or thinking in particular about itself, but as present to itself, and it cannot know any object whatever, except jointly with knowing self through direct consciousness. By this direct consciousness the intellect has knowledge of itself which is absolutely intuitive. Without this intuition of self as present, we could not have the evidence that our reflex knowledge of self is objectively real, or is anything more than ideal. The ideas which the intellect forms of itself as an object, are derived from images pictured in the fancy ; for, as psychology teaches, all our ideas of any objects whatever, are formed dependently on the ministry of some or other representations in the fancy. Thus it happens that the intellect knows itself reflexly by means of ideas, just as it knows any object different from itself. The intellect's reflex knowledge of itself as an object is intuitive, though such intuition is not so immediate as is direct consciousness. Reflex knowledge is not necessarily opposed to intuition ; it is opposed to direct knowledge.

What is the first *object* known by man's intellect ? Does it first know itself, its own act, or first know another object distinct from self ?

The first object actually known by man's intellect, or known by means of an idea expressing that object, is not the intellect's own act of knowing, as "I think, cogito." It is true that the intellect must have direct though confused consciousness even of its first act of knowing an object by means of an idea ; and thus it is able to rethink such idea reflexly. The intellect cannot rethink and *recognize* an idea not previously *cognized as its own*, at least in a confused manner. Man's intellect knows itself or its act, "I think, cogito," as an object, only by a reflex and secondary act ; nor can the intellect by means of a mental word or idea expressly know itself to exist, except by the reflex operation of seeing itself act or

¹ St. Thomas says, p. 1, qu. 14, a 2, ad. 3, "intellectus sic intelligit seipsum per speciem intelligibilem sicut et alia ;" with Aristotle in 3 de Anima, καὶ τὸ διανοεῖσθαι ὁ νοῦς ὡς νοῦς : The intellect knows itself by means of an idea just as it knows other objects.

² "Anima semper intelligit se non discernendo vel cogitando aliquid de se sed in quantum praesens est sibi," St. Thomas in 2 sent disp. 39, qu. 1, a. 1.

think, and then inferring its existence therefrom. Hence, the question as with Descartes, may be thus stated: is man's first cognition "cogito, I think?" Does man know only by inference, or only as a logical conclusion, "*ergo, existo*, therefore I exist?"

While it is true that the intellect's own act is not the first thing which the intellect knows, or of which it forms its first idea, sensible things being the first objects thus known; yet, the intellect has, at least confusedly, direct consciousness of its act and its own existence when it does first know its connatural object. As before said, the intellect first directly knows its act of knowing another object jointly with knowing that object; it is only then it can first reflexly know that act or itself, by forming for itself an idea of that act or of itself.

Descartes makes the *primum cognitum* for man's intellect, or the first object known to it, *cogito*, I think. But this act cannot be known as an object, till after the act of thinking something else; the first object known is the thing which is thought, not the mere act by which it is thought. The primary object of man's intellect is the sensible thing; ¹ yet, his intellect, in itself, would be capable of knowing any being whatever, provided it were duly presented to it. "I think" is not the first thing known; for direct knowledge is prior to reflex knowledge, and to know as an object that "I think," is reflex cognition.

Descartes assumed that the "primum cognitum" is also the "primum philosophicum," and that "cogito," I think, is the primum cognitum. Both these hypotheses are untrue in fact; "cogito," I think, is not the first object known to the human mind. Besides, philosophy, or philosophical reasoning, must start from general principles of metaphysics or axioms, because they are the absolute criteria of philosophical truth. In describing the origin of ideas and of man's knowledge, it will be pertinent to that special aim to ascertain what is naturally first known to the human mind. When man's knowledge is thus considered in the order of its first origin, it must be said that objects are known prior to acts, and acts are known prior to the power of eliciting those acts.²

Reflection is mental work which the intellect is carrying on daily; it is an exercise of attention by which the mind either contemplates its own acts as its own acts, or considers the objects ex-

¹ "Intellectus humani, qui est conjunctus corpori, proprium objectum est quidditas, sive natura in materia corporali existens, et per hujusmodi naturas rerum visibillum, etiam in invisibillum rerum aliquam cognitionem ascendit." (Div. Thom., 1 p., qu. 84, art. 7 in C.). The object of the human intellect which is conjoined to the body, is the essence or nature existing in corporeal matter; and by means of such *natures* of visible things, it also ascends to some knowledge of invisible things.

² St. Thomas, p. 1, qu. 87, a. 3 in C., with Aristotle, "Objecta præcognoscuntur actibus, et actus potentiis."

pressed in its ideas. When one returns to the idea in his mind, and contemplates it as an idea in his own mind, or as a modification of himself as its subject, then his reflection is styled by some authors psychological. But when one returns to the idea in his mind, in order to consider the object represented by that idea, not thinking of the idea itself as an idea, or of himself as having that idea, then the reflection is ontological. For example, we may think of a *triangle*, in order to consider the nature and properties of that figure, but without thinking at all of the idea that is representing the triangle in the mind; this reflection would be ontological. Or we may think of our idea which represents the triangle, in order to consider the idea, or how our mind acts when it thinks this idea; our reflection is then psychological. In both kinds of reflection the mind, in some manner, rethinks its ideas, since it recalls or returns to those ideas in order to consider them again.

The intellect, by its direct consciousness, is proximately disposed, and ready actually to reflect on itself and see its own acts objectively as its own; hence direct consciousness is often styled habitual consciousness. In this direct consciousness the intellect has undistinguished and confused knowledge of itself and its act conjointly with knowing objects by means of those acts, and such knowledge of itself in direct consciousness is immediate knowledge. The medium or principle by which it knows itself directly is not an idea of itself, nor does it see its own essence; but it knows its own presence intimately, immediately, directly. The intellect is thus directly and immediately knowable to self by means of its act, because besides being present to self, it is an immaterial or spiritual faculty. This direct consciousness is by some aptly styled "inner consciousness," it being the soul's inmost self-knowledge; by others this power of knowing self is less happily called "sensus intimus," or the inmost sense. In thus knowing itself, the intellect's presence to itself—or, more strictly, the intellect as present to itself—concurs, as before observed, by way of a principle, somewhat as the idea concurs, by way of a principle, with the intellect in knowing objects extrinsic to itself.

When the intellect knows itself as an object, its action is then reflex or introspective. In this reflex operation the intellect forms an idea in which it expresses itself as an object, using representations in the fancy, as it does in forming ideas of other objects. Hence the idea of itself thus formed presupposes direct consciousness, back on which the intellect returns by this operation of reflex consciousness.

Such reflex knowledge of self is peculiar only to intellectual or spiritual natures, for no organic faculty is capable of this self-introspection, or, as it is expressed, of returning on itself with a com-

plete return.¹ A nature that is capable of reflex action, by which it knows itself and its own acts as its own, or perceives them as in itself, must be *simply* and *totally* present to itself, and, consequently, it cannot consist of extended parts joined to parts. In other words, such a nature cannot consist of parts outside of parts or of parts occupying different divisions of space; but it must be one simple, indivisible unity, completely present to self or compenetrating self.

It may be easily conceived how an intelligent being thus simply and totally present to itself can perceive and know itself, because the act, the power of perceiving and the object perceived by it are present to each other, and they are duly proportioned to each other; the faculty, the object and the act are all compenetratively present to each other, which is impossible when the faculty is an organic one, as will be shown further on. This direct and reflex operation of the soul, by which it knows itself, and its acts as its own, furnishes one of the most conclusive proofs of the soul's simplicity and spirituality, since none but an unextended, indivisible and completely simple nature could have such action.

Since the intellect's knowledge of its own existence by direct consciousness is so immediately intuitive, we should say that the intellect knows its own existence *in* its acts rather than *by means* of its acts; for the acts of the intellect, in direct consciousness, do not serve as a logical medium from which its existence is inferred. They serve rather as a medium *in quo*, as the mirror does when it expresses one's countenance visibly to him.

Direct consciousness of self seems to be the nearest approach which the human intellect makes, in our present state of existence, towards immediately apprehending the concrete *singular*. It is believed that the separate or disembodied soul perceives itself directly and perfectly as *singular*. The intellect perceives its own act immediately in direct consciousness then, because it is present and it is duly proportioned as an object to the intellect's natural power of knowing; it is, indeed, both medium and object known. God is also most intimately present to the soul and its faculties; He is present as conserving them in existence and action. But though God is thus present to the intellect, yet His essence is not an object proportioned to man's intellect, so as to be immediately apprehensible or visible, even in a confused manner, through the natural light of reason. The light or medium required for the human intellect to see God's essence intuitively is a supernatural principle, is the "*lumen gloriæ*."

¹ "Substantiæ intellectuales redeunt ad essentiam suam reditione completa."—P. 1, qu. 14, a. 2, ad. 1.

An organic faculty is incapable of either direct or reflex consciousness. As a fact, for example, the eye, which is admitted to be the most perfect of our external senses, sees, but it does not see that it sees; it gives no testimony of what happens in itself when seeing, it gives testimony only of the visible object *external* to itself. No wonder, then, that mankind did not know till Kepler proved the fact, at the beginning of the 17th century, that the eye sees by means of an image of the visible object projected by the lens of the eye on the retina. Hence the eye does not see itself seeing; the object perceived by a sense must be extrinsic to it. As St. Thomas says, "The external sense never perceives its own act, and, therefore, the act of that sense is perceived by the common sensory."¹ We have no evidence whatever that even the fancy, which is the brightest internal sense, knows its own act of imagining or picturing objects, which it always does by clothing those objects with corporeal properties. Even the brute must have a power answering to the common sensory; for no animal can direct its own actions in relation to the objects of its external senses, or practically co-ordinate and unify its movements in respect to those objects, unless it knows them as one complete sentient nature knows. Consequently, even the brute animal necessarily requires some *one* faculty which can distinguish all the external sensations; that is, even the irrational animal requires the power hereby attributed to the common sensory. Yet brutes have no intellect, because they cannot know what is wholly abstract, as is the universal; nor can they know the subject and predicate of a judgment separately, and then conjoin them with the copula. The action of the fancy, as well as that of the common sensory, is always direct; it is never reflex, nor can either one of those internal senses know itself or be cognizant of itself jointly with knowing an object, as the intellect is in its direct consciousness when it apprehends or thinks of any object.

According to a theory long taught in all the schools and not yet replaced by an equally satisfactory one, the common sensory² is an organ in the brain, in which as in a centre, the nerves from all the external senses meet, or rather, from which as a radix or centre, nerves extend to the external senses. While this internal sense perceives what reaches it from the external senses, and transmits it to the fancy, yet neither it nor the fancy can perceive itself or its own act, any more than the eye can. This is because organic powers cannot retroact, are not capable of self-introspec-

¹ "Sensus proprius non sentit actum suum, et ideo actus sensus proprii percipitur per sensum communem."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 3, ad. 3.

² Many physiologists now give a more extended meaning to the phrase "common sensory," making it signify the entire nervous system as capable of sensation.

tion and thereby of contemplating their own internal actions. Not being simple agents, they are present to themselves only quantitatively, or as extended matter, having parts adjoined to each other by extraposition. A sense cannot perceive any object, unless that object be extrinsic to the sense. Hence, if we suppose a sense to perceive itself or its act as its own act, we must conceive that sense to be, at the same time, the external object perceived, and the power perceiving it; or it must be extrinsically presented as an object before itself, and thus be in two separate places at one and the same time, a supposition which is absurd. An organic power does not know the external object's representative likeness which is in itself; it perceives only the object producing such likeness in it: the eye does not see the image on the retina, it sees only the object producing that image. But it is easy to conceive the intellect's act of knowing its own act immediately and directly; for the object seen and the power seeing it are, in this case, simple and one, they have no quantity, no parts outside of parts, but are completely and absolutely present one to the other. This fact that the intellect does know its own act, furnishes the most conclusive proof, as said, of the soul's simplicity.

Here it may be asked, does the intellect, then, in its consciousness, apprehend only its own acts, or does it distinctly apprehend also itself as the subject of those acts? Does the intellect by means of its consciousness perceive the soul's essence or the nature of the soul? St. Augustine says,¹ pertinently to these questions, "the human soul is so made that it is never unmindful of self, never fails to know itself, never fails to love itself." St. Bonaventure teaches that man's intellect knows itself, "*scientia notitiæ, non scientia discretionis*"; that is, the intellect knows itself with knowledge that notices or sees, not, however, with knowledge which discerns, or distinguishes. St. Thomas says that the intellect knows itself and knows also its act of knowing.²

In direct consciousness, the intellect implicitly knows or apprehends itself as the subject of its own acts, though it does not know itself explicitly as an object; it knows itself jointly with its idea of any object, but not, as before said, by a separate idea of itself, and this is to know itself implicitly as the subject of such idea. While the intellect can thus directly think itself, it can also rethink itself, "*mens se cogitat, et se recogitat*;" and in rethinking self, it does so by forming an idea expressing itself explicitly. In thus rethinking self, by returning on itself, we again see how the intellect is the faculty knowing, the object known,

¹ "Sic condita est mens humana, ut nunquam sui non meminerit, nunquam se non intelligat, nunquam se non diligit."—*De Trinit.* lib. 14, c. 14, No. 18.

² "Intellectus cognoscit seipsum, et suum intelligere."—*Contr. gent.*, lib. 2, c. 66.

and the subject of the 'knowledge, "sciens et scitum sunt una res." St. Thomas thus states the order in which the acts of consciousness succeed each other, "what is first known by the human intellect, is the essence of a material thing; and secondarily is known the act by which the object is known; and by means of the act the intellect itself is known, whose perfection it is to understand."¹

We may here consider the soul as knowing itself under two respects; and first, to borrow the terminology of the old schools, by way of answer to the question, "an sit;" that is, does knowledge of the soul's existence fall under consciousness? Secondly, as to the question "quid sit," does the essence or the nature of the soul fall under consciousness? The soul knows its own existence immediately and intuitively through its direct consciousness, by the simple and indivisible presence of the soul to itself; but it does not know its existence by way of an object, except reflexly, and as expressed by means of an universal idea, just as it knows any other object.

The intellect does not know immediately and intuitively its own nature nor its essential properties as a spiritual substance. The soul comes to the knowledge of its own nature and properties, only by reasoning to them from its acts manifested in direct consciousness. Hence, the soul's knowledge of its own nature as a spiritual substance, is abstract knowledge, not immediate or intuitive knowledge. If the intellect directly and immediately apprehended its own essence and that of the soul, then all minds would know evidently the nature of the soul and think alike both of it and its essential properties. While consciousness gives intuitive knowledge of the soul as existing, yet knowledge of the soul's *nature* is abstract; and on this account many minds are ignorant of the soul's nature, since ignorance or error more easily occurs in regard to truth which requires abstract and difficult demonstration. As St. Thomas says,² "For acquiring knowledge of the mind, its presence does not suffice, but diligent and subtle inquiry is required. Hence it comes that many are ignorant of the soul's nature, and also that many have erred concerning the soul's nature."

Since reflex consciousness of self is always accompanied with direct consciousness, for the mind does not think rationally of any object without direct consciousness in some degree, at least, it

¹ "Id quod primo cognoscitur ab intellectu humano est natura rei materialis; et secundario cognoscitur ipse actus quo cognoscitur objectum; et per actum cognoscitur ipse intellectus, cujus est perfectio ipsum intelligere."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 3.

² "Ad cognitionem de mente habendam non sufficit ejus praesentia sed requiritur diligens et subtilis inquisitio, unde et multi naturam animæ ignorant, et multi etiam circa naturam animæ erraverunt."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 1, in C.

follows that no mind can positively doubt of its own existence or of its own conscious acts.

Through self-consciousness, the intellect has a perception not only of its own act, but also of the will's acts. The explanation of this truth is made more evident and the fact is more easily comprehended, if it be borne in mind that the will is intrinsically and radically of the reason, and since the reason is conceived to be its subject, it is usually defined to be "the rational appetite."¹ As St. Thomas says, the act of the will is seen by the intellect, for it is in the intellect as in its first principle and in its proper subject; Aristotle uses similar language, "the will is in the reason." Experience attests the fact, however, that acts of the will are less evident to us than are acts of the intellect itself. The intellect has habitual knowledge also of the body, dependently on the senses; and it can readily have actual or reflex conscious knowledge of what sensibly affects the body.

Consciousness is essential to responsibility; but in insane mental action, in dreaming, and in total absent-mindedness the intellect does not know itself, or its acts, or the objective order of things, in their true and real relations; and hence the will, in these abnormal states of the intellect, is not capable of rational choice.

Dr. Reid says truly that "consciousness is always employed about the present." But his language is less accurate when he asserts, with Locke, that "consciousness is an internal sense"; for it is, under different respects, an act of the intellect, and the faculty itself of intellect. It is true that "consciousness is always employed about the present;" but it can give present testimony also of its own past operations.

When the soul is separated from the body, it has no fancy to mirror representations before it, and the intellect cannot naturally form an idea or mental word expressing any object without the concurrence of an image in the fancy. Will the intellect, when the soul is in such a condition, be unable to know itself or its acts reflexly?

It is reasonable to suppose that the soul when it is separated from the body should have all the action befitting its disembodied state of existence, and, therefore, being of a simple and spiritual nature, that it should have consciousness both direct and reflex, more perfectly than it now has. The soul's direct consciousness, it may be consistently inferred, should consist in the immediate and evident intuition of its own essence as present, with a fulness of

¹ "Inclinatio intelligibilis, quæ est actus voluntatis, est intelligibiliter in intelligente sicut in primo principio, et in proprio subjecto, unde philosophus dicit (*De Anima*, lib. 3, text 42) voluntas in ratione est."—P. I, qu. 87, a. 4, see also ad. 3, of the same article.

² Vol. ii., essay vi., ch. i.

self-perception. The intellect's act of reflexly viewing itself with its retained past acts, could not be by means of ideas abstracted from representations in the fancy; it would immediately perceive the soul's essence, that essence being immaterial, present to the intellect, and as an object proportioned to it.¹

There seems no reason to doubt that the human intellect, in that state of the soul's existence, could recall and reflexly know itself with its past acts. Since the intellect's ideas acquired while the soul is in union with the body are its own acts, it is legitimately inferred that they will be retained and recognized by the intellectual memory, when the soul is separated from the body. After the soul and body shall have been reunited in a perfect state of existence, the soul, it may reasonably be conjectured, will then have greater supremacy over the body than it now has; at least, as to its faculties and their virtues. The soul's specific method of knowing by reason, will then be perfected by the body, not impeded by it, as in our present state. The soul will then see intuitively and distinctly its own essence, the nature of the union between soul and body, and all intrinsic properties of the composite thereby formed.

Strictly speaking, the intellect cannot be said to have knowledge at all of any object, unless it know, at least, confusedly, its own act as its own, and itself as the subject of its own act, jointly with knowing the object. As observed by an acute thinker, "an act of the intellect, when it exists, certifies its own existence by means of itself;² that is, is certified by direct consciousness. A self-evident thing certifies itself objectively; the intellect consciously perceiving, certifies its act, and itself as perceiving by that act.

Reid regards the intellect's necessary assent to what is thus self-evident to it, as instinctive; Mill usually calls such assent, the mind's "belief"; Sir Wm. Hamilton asserts, with Luther whom he cites, that "the certainty of all our knowledge is ultimately resolvable into a certainty of belief."³ They all suppose that no

¹ The following citation will indicate the manner in which the scholastic authors reason on this subject: "Non opus est specie intelligibili quando objectum est per se praesens intellectui, et immateriale . . . species impressa solum ponitur ut suppleat absentiam et efficacitatem objecti. . . . Duo sunt officia speciei, nempe, objectum repraesentare intellectui, et cum intellectu active concurrere ad eliciendam visionem."—(Becanus, Tract. I, c. 9, qu. 2.) That is, "There is no need of an intelligible species (idea), when the object itself is immediately present to the intellect, and is immaterial. The impressed species is intended to supply the absence and the efficacy of the object. There are two offices of the species, namely, to represent the object to the intellect, and actively to concur with the intellect in eliciting vision," or perception.

² "Actus intellectus cum existit, per seipsam certificat de sua existentia."—Mauro, tom. i., qu. 12, ad 2.

³ Logic, sect. 17. It favors the views of skepticism thus to distort the term "belief

degree of self-evidence fully accounts as cause and sufficient reason for the intellect's assent to any truth. To resolve all certainty of our knowledge, however, into a "certainty of belief," is to reduce all our certainty to a blind assent of the intellect to what it accepts on trust, as true; but this would not be genuine certainty at all. For evident truth produces certainty, not because believed in, but because it is seen as evident truth. Assent to truth clearly seen through its own evidence, is not belief. Belief is assent of the intellect to evident truth, on account of credible testimony. Belief is not even rational assent at all, if it never has presupposed to it perfect evidence of credibility as its ultimate motive. If all our certainty is belief, we cannot be strictly said to have knowledge at all.

As already observed, the nearest approach which the human intellect makes, in our present life on earth, to knowing the concrete singular object directly, is in the act of direct consciousness by which the intellect knows itself *praesentialiter*, or knows itself immediately, as present to itself. Yet this immediate knowledge which the intellect has of itself in direct consciousness is not perfect, because its perception of itself is not distinctly expressed in a mental word or idea. St. Thomas states and answers an objection¹ which will help to render the explanation of this subject more intelligible: "Our intellect perceives itself; but the intellect is a singular object, otherwise it could not have an act, since acts are of singular things; therefore, our intellect knows the singular." Answer, "The singular is not repugnant to intellectual power, as singular, but as being material; because nothing is understood, except in an immaterial manner. Therefore, if there be something both singular and immaterial, as the intellect is, that is not repugnant to intellectual power."

The objection is based on the assumption that the human intellect does not know any singular concrete object, except in a secondary manner and reflexly; namely, by applying to that object an idea or mental word previously formed for expressing what is conceived to be the object's essence, and in fact this is always the intellect's action in knowing a singular object which is material. For instance, when an object is presented through the senses, the intellect, at least, implicitly asks the question, "quid est; what is it?" After duly observing and reflecting, the intellect forms its idea or word which expresses the answering *quiddity*, or essence of the object as understood by it, and it can then by a second action apply its idea to that singular object proposed by the senses.

from its original and proper signification. Locke, bk. iv., ch. 15, § 3, attributes to the word "belief" its received meaning.

¹ P. 1, qu. 86, a. 1, objection 3.

The intellect must needs know what the nature of an object is before it can *say*, so to speak, what that object is ; or the intellect's first operation in knowing is to form its idea of the object proposed to it, and its next act is to apply that idea directly to the object, and this is its act of knowing that object.

The idea formed by the intellect to express the *quiddity* or essence of a proposed concrete and actual thing is, of its nature, a universal, since every ideal essence is universal or general. Yet, the intellect may not, at first forming such idea, reflexly attend to its character as universal ; the idea as in this manner first formed is styled a direct universal, not a reflex one, because it is not seen explicitly as applicable to all its inferiors, in which case it would be the reflex universal. But although such idea be not reflexly generalized, nevertheless, it is, as before said, of its very nature, universal. St. Thomas thus expresses the thought, " Our intellect does not understand a thing, except by abstracting ; and by the very abstraction from material conditions, that which is abstracted is made universal."¹

Attention to the action of one's own mind in knowing, when a new or unfamiliar object is presented, will enable him to see for himself that, as a fact, his intellect's action is just that which is above described ; namely, before the intellect can know the singular concrete object presented through the senses, it must form its idea or mental word expressive of what the object's nature is, and then it can with another act know the particular object by means of this previously formed idea. Hence the human intellect is said to know the universal primarily and directly, and to know the singular secondarily and reflexly.

It may be repeated, then, by way of conclusion, that consciousness is self-knowledge, and this self-knowledge is most strictly and properly direct consciousness. Reflex consciousness is self-knowledge because founded on the direct, and because it includes the direct. Indeed it is only by means of direct consciousness that the intellect immediately perceives its own acts as its own, or knows itself as the subject of those acts ; "*non per essentiam suam, sed per actum suum cognoscit se intellectus*," the intellect knows itself by means of its own acts, not by perceiving its own essence directly.² Direct consciousness is the intellect's immediate intuition of its own acts as its own acts ; reflex consciousness of self, is rather an act of *reason*, by which an idea or mental word is formed and made to express distinctly the intellect's act as an object.

WALTER H. HILL, S. J.

¹ P. I, qu. 57, a. 2, ad. 1.

² P. I, qu. 87, a. 1, in C.

“IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, IN
OMNIBUS CARITAS.”

B*Y necessary* things we are to understand revealed truths, the truths of faith. Faith is necessary, since “without faith it is impossible to please God” (Heb. xi., 6), and without pleasing God here we cannot come to the possession of eternal happiness hereafter, the one thing necessary for all. Saving or divine faith implies *unity* in the source of the truths believed, and in the individuals believing. God must be the author or revealer of the truths He wishes us to believe, and all men must believe the same truths, and there can be no contradiction in the truths themselves.

All men may not explicitly believe the same number of truths, since some may, without any fault of theirs, be ignorant of some revealed truths. But even these must be in the disposition to believe all as soon and as far as they are known to them. Without this disposition a man cannot have true faith. For we cannot refuse belief in one revealed truth without forfeiting faith altogether. Those disciples made shipwreck of the faith who followed our Lord until His revealing to them that He would give them His flesh to eat, but then “went back and walked no more with him,” saying, “this saying is hard and who can hear it” (St. John, vi., 61)?

Nor is it for man to say this truth is important, that other is non-essential. All revealed truths are equally essential. Deny one, and you deny the veracity of God. Neither is it for man to choose what truths to believe, but it belongs to God to propose what truths He will have him to believe. Were it otherwise, man’s mind would determine revealed truth instead of being determined by it, would subject revealed truth to itself instead of being made subject to it; reason would be above faith, man above God. In choosing how much to believe, man would be independent of the Divine Mediator. For our Lord is mediator only through faith in His words. And as faith is a means to an end, he that puts himself above the means, is independent of them; and this he does who determines the means for himself, who chooses how much to believe.

So far as to what ought to be. As to matter of fact, all Catholics believe revealed truths, the unlearned as well as the learned. For in believing all the Church believes and teaches, they include the sum total of revealed truths. For the Church of Christ has by

Him been established custodian of all revealed truth, and guaranteed from error by His solemn promise.

Non-Catholics do not believe all revealed truths. Their very denial of the authority of the Church of God as sole teacher of revealed truth, as alone divinely warranted and divinely commissioned to teach all nations in all times, is a direct rejection of a revealed truth. For there is nothing more plainly or more emphatically, if we may use the expression, revealed than this truth.

But how far are non-Catholics culpable in refusing to believe in the divine mission of the Catholic Church divinely founded, and in what she proposes to our belief with infallible certainty? Do they refuse to believe because the truth is not duly expounded to them? Or are they unwilling to know the truth, lest they should believe? How many are in the way of salvation because of invincible ignorance? These and similar questions cannot be answered with absolute certainty, and therefore come under the heading *In Dubiis Libertas*.

Opinions are free where there can be only opinion, and there can be only opinion where the subject is debatable, where a greater or less degree of probability is the most that can be reached. And, here, if anywhere, there is need of charity. For we are all but too apt to over-rate each his own opinion. Each one has undoubtedly the right to form and to hold his opinion. But he should remember that the one who differs from him has an equal right to his opinion. And yet there are those who claim all freedom for their own opinions and make its sphere as wide as possible, but censure others who circumscribe their freedom within narrower limits. It is as if a man who used his freedom in frequenting the parks and promenades, should blame another for using his freedom in confining himself to his room.

We cannot find fault with another if he holds the opinion that, where the Catholic Church is established and where consequently the truth she teaches is accessible to all and easily attainable, very few non-Catholics are excusable for remaining in their errors. He quotes the words of our Lord to His apostles: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, going forth from thence, shake the dust from your feet for a testimony to them" (St Mark, vi., 11). "Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorra in the day of judgment, than for that city" (St. Mat., x., 15). If we allege prejudice as a sufficient plea for our "erring brethren" to-day, he will say the Jews were also prejudiced against the Apostles, and it did not excuse them. If we urge that the truths of faith are not properly nor sufficiently explained to non-Catholics, nor brought within their reach, he will add that our Lord explained His doctrine sufficiently to those who heard Him,

and yet many did not believe, and were consequently inexcusable, as He himself declared. It can be so now too.

But it is uncharitable to think so many are out of the right way, out of the way of salvation. We ought not to condemn them, but rather try to excuse them for their perhaps involuntary error. It cannot be uncharitable, he replies, to publish the truths God has revealed and belief in which He declares necessary for salvation. If He says faith in all is necessary, how can we say that faith in some will do? We cannot believe in the truth without condemning the opposite error. When our actions are opposed to our faith we have to condemn ourselves, and hear ourselves condemned by our best friend, the pastor of our souls. Are we uncharitable to ourselves? Is he uncharitable to us for warning us of our danger and frightening us away from the precipice? We condemn no one, he continues, we only help them not to be condemned. Our telling them the truth may, for all we know, be the means of their coming to embrace it. And even should they remain obstinate for the present, they may at some future time act on our warning, and we will have done a charitable act in thus endeavoring to rescue them from their danger. Our Lord expounded His doctrine to many whom He knew would reject it. The Apostles were told to "go teach all nations," and yet were given to understand beforehand that not all would "obey the truth," not even hear them, nor receive them. There is no one having a spark of charity who will not do all he can to bring non-Catholics to the true faith. But how will he, why should he, exert himself for this, if he believes that many Protestants are already in the right way? Is it not better to leave them in their prejudices, if prejudice can validly excuse them? Not thus did Catholics act toward the Arians, Nestorians, and other erring brethren. Is it only within the last three centuries that denying revealed truth or refusing to believe it is harmless? If so many of them are all right, there is no danger in marrying a non-Catholic. The children may be brought up non-Catholics, and their error is just as innocent as that of their father or mother. What difference does it make, many a Catholic will say? They are Christians as well as we. We must charitably suppose that they are honest in their convictions. Behold religious indifference, but one remove from loss of faith! To sum up, God alone knows who are and who are not excusable for not embracing the whole truth. If we know not whether we ourselves are worthy of love or hatred, much less can we say a large number of Protestants are all right.

But do you not believe Cardinals Manning and Newman, Fathers Faber and Lockhart, Dr. Ward and our own illustrious Brownson were sincere followers of the truth even before they became

Catholics? Yes, he rejoins, but do you not see that these same sincere followers of the truth became all of them Catholics? You say so many are *in good faith*. How do you know they are? And why be so positive on what you do not know? Charity for our erring brethren will not endow us with the attribute of God alone, the knowledge of the human heart. If we tell Protestants, in the name of charity, that very many of them are all right where they are, may we not deceive them in a matter of infinite importance? And is that charity? We are told "to see with the eyes of the Lord." Let those who can, do it. We cannot. God is merciful, and also just. Judgment belongs to Him. All we can with certainty affirm is that there is but one true form of Christianity, and can be but one. All the rest are counterfeits. Not believing in the Church of Christ is denying "the Pillar and Ground of truth," is denying the Spouse of Christ, the wisdom of Christ, the word of Christ and consequently the divinity of Christ. For if His word can fail, more yet, if it has failed, Christ is not God. Christ said His Church should never fail; Protestants say it has failed. Is that belief in His divinity?

We are told to follow the example of that "big-hearted Apostle, St. Paul," and are asked, "what plan would he lay out to reach them" (Protestants)? We for one do not know. But we do know something of his plan when he was on earth. Whilst making himself all to all, he said to the Galatians: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal., i., 8). Luther and Calvin and Henry VIII. were not St. Pauls, nor angels either. St. Paul said again: "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth?" He might say the same now to the followers of false leaders. Father Harper answered Dr. Pusey's *Eirenikon* in a book whose significant title is "Peace Through the Truth." We say charity through the truth, conversion through the truth, liberty through the truth, salvation through the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. "The truth shall make you free" (St. John, viii., 32). "Male vivitur," says St. Augustine, "si de Deo non bene sentitur" (De Civ. Dei, L. V., 10).

We know we shall be set down by many as ungenerous, unkind, unpitiful in our opinion. But we must, at the peril of our life eternal, believe all revealed truths as far as they are known to us, and our ignorance of them must not be culpable. Ignorance will not excuse us where we can and ought to know better. How can we presume so far as to say to others that for them it is enough to believe some revealed truths? God is not a respecter of persons, to say one thing for me, another for others, in matters of faith.

But our acknowledged motto is "In omnibus caritas." We leave you perfectly free to hold a very different opinion.

The words in our heading, "in dubiis libertas," may seem to some to involve a contradiction to the dictum of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free." If those that are in doubt are already free, they cannot be made free by the truth. Those that are free cannot be made free. But the contradiction vanishes if we consider for a moment that in doubtful things a person is free to take either side of two opposite views of a question. But that is not true freedom when a man is free to choose between two masters. In doubt there are two parties contending for possession of the bewildered mind, to neither of which it can deliver itself without forfeiting its native dignity and freedom. If a man is blind-folded or fettered, he cannot advance, nor is he free. Ignorance blind-folds the eyes of the soul, doubt fetters it, on its way to heaven. Truth removes both impediments. The soul sees, it runs. The intellect knows the true, the will desires the good, and the whole being lays hold on the beautiful. Without knowing the true, man cannot love the good. But by loving the *Summum Bonum* "he is free and not detained," says the *Imitation*. True liberty, moral liberty, is "the power of willing what is right because it is right." He who is ignorant of the right cannot will it; and he who is in doubt does not know what to will. Like the sluggard he "willeth and willeth not."

But rightly or wrongly understood, the word liberty has a charm for most minds. Indeed, some are persuaded that they are doing a service to mankind by reducing to a minimum the class of *necessary* things (truths) where unity is insisted upon, leaving the rest to free opinion. Canon Bartolo, in his late work, "Criteria of Catholic Truth," as quoted by the *Catholic World*, for October last,¹ asks of the Sovereign Pontiffs, "when, for the future, they shall in their prudence and wisdom exercise their infallible authority, to make use of the actual words of the Council of the Vatican; that is to say, that they shall declare that they speak *ex cathedra*, and that they address all the faithful." So chary is he of how much he is to believe. This request is very similar to that of a religious who would say to his superior, "when, in future, you want me to do anything, I wish you to tell me whether it is or is not 'in virtue of holy obedience' that you command me?"

But it is in favor of freedom, and it will be allowed, I suppose, to use all freedom in reasoning on his free opinion. If he wishes to be free to hold an opinion differing from the Pope, except when he speaks *ex cathedra*, surely we, however inferior to Canon Bar-

¹ This was written last January.

tolo, may claim the privilege of differing from one who never so speaks.

Reason has its claims on us as well as faith. We are told in Holy Scripture to render unto God our "reasonable service." Faith supposes reason, as reason supposes the senses. Without crediting our senses we cannot have faith, nor can we reason; for "Faith cometh by hearing" (Rom. x., 17), and we cannot form a single idea without a previous action of the senses. Faith cannot oppose reason; it can only go farther than reason. And there is nothing more reasonable than that finite reason should submit to the infinite Creator of reason, when reason itself affirms that He speaks, and that man should firmly believe all that He reveals.

Suppose now that the Pope issues a certain document condemning a certain line of conduct of Catholics in a certain country; are we, living in another country, free to pursue a perfectly similar line of conduct? We think not. Though he addressed only one country, morality, in its very nature, is for all countries when the circumstances are similar. If our consciences tell us the circumstances are similar, whether the papal pronouncement is formally *ex cathedra* or not, it is virtually so; it is so for us and for every one similarly circumstanced. It is not necessary for the Pope to declare formally the nature of his utterances when reason and common sense can determine for each one whether they are really binding on him or not. If the cap fits him he must wear it. Certainly this is the attitude of every good Catholic. Were the Pope to err in directing the morals of one country now, of another again, and then of a third, and so on, soon the whole body of the faithful, the whole Church, under the guidance of their Supreme Head, would be in error, which is contrary to the solemn promise of our Lord.

Again, suppose the Pope condemns certain propositions taught by a certain school of philosophy. Are we free to hold this doctrine as true, on the plea that the Pope did not speak *ex cathedra*? We think not again; for reason will tell us that what is logically connected with a truth of faith is necessarily included in our belief of that truth, and that which is logically opposed to that truth is necessarily condemned. We are accountable for the use of our reason in dealing with matters of faith and morals. If we hold that two and one make five, and yet believe in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but say that these make five, the dogmatic definition of the Trinity condemns our false principle in reasoning. And he who is empowered to define the one has the right to condemn the other. Again, if any one maintains in philosophy that the senses, in their normal state, are deceptive and cannot give us certain cognition, the Pope, who is the divinely appointed guardian

of the faith, has not only the right but the duty to condemn such philosophy. For that "faith cometh by hearing" is a revealed truth, which this philosophy contradicts. So also are we not free to hold or to teach *Ontologism*, condemned by Rome in 1861 and 1862, nor any of the forty propositions out of Rosmini's works, condemned a few years ago. No Catholic worthy of the name will set his private opinion above the decision of the Head of the Church in matters logically connected with faith or morals, such as are most questions of philosophy. He will not ask if such utterances are *ex cathedra*. The one who speaks *ex cathedra* says that these propositions cannot be held consistently with acceptance of *ex cathedra* pronouncements. That is enough. It will not do to profess a faith evidently in conflict with one's philosophy. This would be to suppose that faith and reason can contradict each other, that truths in the natural order can contradict those of the supernatural order. But no two truths, no matter of what order, can contradict each other, for God is the source of all truth, and He cannot contradict Himself. Truth is that which is; but that which is, is, and cannot at the same time not be, no matter how many or few, or what other things are. Rightly, then, does the Supreme Teacher in the Church condemn such propositions as are evidently inconsistent with truths of faith. They must be false.

"Reason," says Canon Bartolo, as quoted by the *Catholic World*, "if it finds a fact of nature or of history in opposition to a truth of revelation, is not obliged to deny the former; it will await a time when an agreement shall be established between them. This will happen either by the discovery of solid motives for doubting the reality of the (scientific or historical) fact in question, or, on the other hand, by demonstrating that what was deemed revealed truth was but simply the opinion of theologians."

But suppose that while awaiting an "agreement between them" the reasoner's time on earth is finished, what then? And suppose, farther, that the supposed (scientific or historical) fact is, in fact, no fact at all, even though science or history maintained it was; and that the revealed truth in question was in very truth revealed, and not merely the opinion of the theologians at all (suppositions that are, to say the least, very possible, not to say probable), what then? Has that reasoner made shipwreck of the faith or not? His faith is certainly not that which made the martyrs, nor yet the confessors of the Church. You may call it scientific or historic faith, any faith you please, but not divine faith. This faith is made of sterner stuff. The small catechism, issued by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, says: "Faith is a divine virtue, by which we firmly believe the truths which God has revealed." But how can he *firmly* believe a truth for the verification of which

he awaits the revelations of science or history? The catechism of the Council of Trent, explaining the first article of the Creed, says: "The meaning of these words (I believe in God) is this: I believe with certainty and without a shadow of doubt profess my belief." . . . And again: "The word 'believe,' therefore, does not mean 'to think,' 'to imagine,' 'to be of opinion,' but as the Sacred Scriptures teach, it expresses the deepest conviction of the mind, by which we give a firm and unhesitating assent to God revealing His mysterious truths. . . . Faith, therefore, excludes not only all doubt, but even the desire of subjecting its truths to demonstration."

What now becomes of Canon Bartolo's faith awaiting the "discovery of solid motives for doubting the reality of the scientific or historical fact," ere it pronounces for or against the revealed truth?

The Council of the Vatican has defined: "The Doctrine which God hath revealed hath not been proposed as some philosophical discovery to be perfected by the wit of man, but hath been entrusted to Christ's Spouse as a Divine Deposit to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared" (Sess. iii., chap. 4). But Canon Bartolo will have revealed truth stand or fall according as it does or does not pass the ordeal of some (supposed) fact of science or history. "He (Bartolo) teaches," says the *Catholic World*, "that in the canonization of saints the Church is, indeed, exercising her sovereign authority, but that the note of infallibility does not attach to the judgments thus made." A person may then believe that there are no saints at all in Heaven. If the Church can err in teaching that one saint is in Heaven, she can err in all. We need not believe that the Apostles are in Heaven, not even St. Paul, who was wrapt into the third Heaven while "in the body or out of the body," he knew not; nor St. Stephen, who saw "the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God;" nor any of the martyrs, nor St. Joseph, the Foster-father of our Lord, nor even the Immaculate Mother herself. For we can repeat with St. Augustine: "I would not believe the Gospel itself but for the authority of the Catholic Church."

And what becomes of the infallible decision of the Council of Trent, defining that "the saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men,—that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance, to obtain favors from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour" (Sess. 25)? How can the Church be infallible in declaring we may pray to the saints in Heaven, if she is fallible in declaring that they are in Heaven? Again, if miracles are insufficient to establish the sanctity of the saints beyond the possibility of error, how can the miracles of our

Lord be appealed to as proving His Divinity? Will God work miracles at the intercession of the canonized saints in order to deceive first the Vicar of Christ on earth and then all the faithful? And are we free to think that Sts. Gervase and Protase may have been in hell, for all we know, whilst a touch of their relics was restoring sight to a man that was blind, which miracle was witnessed by all the people of Milan, St. Augustine among them? But if the Church's decision in regard to canonized saints can deceive us, then may she have deceived us in the case of Sts. Gervase and Protase.

Again, is there no morality in question in our praying to saints in heaven who may not be there? Surely it cannot be morally right to honor with public veneration and with prayers for their intercession those whom God does not honor, but may have condemned. Nor can we think that that is the "Infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed," to use the words of the Vatican Council in defining the Pope's infallibility. How does Canon Bartolo, a private theologian, know that the canonization of saints is not included in what He willed to secure His Church from erring? The Vatican Council says, at the end of the First Constitution: "It sufficeth not to avoid heresy, unless those errors which more or less approach thereto are sedulously shunned." Does it not approach to the denying of the utility of praying to the saints, which utility was dogmatically affirmed by the Council of Trent, to hold, as Bartolo says we can, that we are not certain there are any saints in heaven? We have no other way of being certain of it than through the Church, but she, he says, in this can err. In fine, are we to accept his private opinion on the extent of Catholic freedom of opinion, or the statement of the Head of the Church? Pius IX., in a brief addressed to the Archbishop of Munich in 1863, laid down the Catholic principles on the subject of freedom of opinion, from which brief the twenty-second proposition condemned in the "Syllabus" was taken and runs thus: "The obligation under which Catholic teachers and writers lie, is restricted to those matters which are proposed for universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church." Granting that this part of the brief was not *ex cathedra*, which Canon Bartolo cannot prove, still every Catholic will prefer the opinion of the Head of the Church to that of a private individual, especially when it coincides with the infallible statement of the Vatican Council quoted above. "It sufficeth not to avoid heresy unless those errors which . . . are sedulously shunned."

Of the "Syllabus" Cardinal Manning writes: "During the preceding eighteen years, he (Pius IX.) had in numerous documents

and manifold acts condemned a multitude of intellectual errors of the day; and the 'Syllabus' is nothing more than a collection, from all the documents and acts of those eighteen preceding years, of the chief errors which he had already condemned. That 'Syllabus' contained eighty such errors, with their censures affixed, together with a reference to the former acts and documents in which the same condemnation had been already published. Now these eighty errors are partly in matters of faith, partly in matters of morals; in both of which the Catholic Church, and the Head of the Catholic Church also, by divine assistance, are infallible; that is, they are the ultimate interpreters of the faith, and the ultimate expositors of the law of God, and that not by the light of human learning only, but by the light of divine assistance, which secures from error. Under morals are also included a number of errors relating to the political state of the world, the Church, and its Head." ("Characteristics from the Writings of Card. Manning," p. 13.)

"The Pope," says Canon Bartolo, "never declared it (Syllabus) infallible" (we quote from the *Catholic World*). But neither did he declare it was not infallible. "The Pontiff himself gave it its right name, a *list* of condemned propositions." But his giving it the name of a list would not hinder it from containing infallible pronouncements. If they were infallible in the original documents their being collected into a list would not make them fallible. A faithful copy of the Scriptures is still the inspired Scriptures, of any document is that document.

"It was sent to the bishops by the papal Secretary of State, and only by *order* of the Pope, who, it is admitted, cannot delegate his infallibility." There was no need to delegate his infallibility. The secretary could send what was infallibly pronounced and collected into a list and given him to send. The sender of a document may not even know its purport without this detracting from the validity of the document, provided it reaches its destination in safety. You might as well say that the letter-carrier affects the contents of the letter he carries. "And, finally, the references in the 'Syllabus' to papal documents of every grade of authority make these the source to which one must go for fixing the dogmatic character of the several condemnations." But if these be dogmatic, the "Syllabus" will be so too, since it is only taken from them. And no matter how manifold the documents, the source from which they emanate is the same, the Head of the Church; and since they relate to faith and morals, they can be infallible. And since the Pope that issued them did not say they were not infallible, Canon Bartolo goes beyond his measure in saying that they are not.

We are told again: "The universality of the faithful, he (Bar-

tolo) holds, may have an erroneous opinion on a religious matter, as long as they do not hold it as revealed truth; though this state of things could not," he adds, "be long tolerated by the infallible authority of the Church." But if the "universality of the faithful," that is, the whole Church, with the toleration of the "infallible authority of the Church," has, even for a short time, an erroneous opinion on a religious matter, then has the Church of Christ erred in the most important of all matters, religion. But Jesus Christ promised it should never err for a short or for a long time. Therefore this proposition is false.

That "on the inspiration of the Holy Scripture Canon Bartolo holds views nearly identical with those of Cardinal Newman" is no proof that the views of either are sound. Cardinal Newman's views were met by overwhelming arguments at the time of their publication. It was no answer to these arguments to say that so short a time had been given to their preparation. The professor in question had spent his whole life, we may say, in studying such questions. What could hinder him from bringing forward better arguments than the Cardinal? Not the relative shortness of time he spent on them, certainly. For one man may in a week bring forward better arguments on a question than another after seven years' study. And this is the reply that has called forth from a popular writer the remark: "Could anything be more scathing? I sometimes wonder to what extent the professor has taken the lesson to heart."

"Canon Bartolo holds," says the *Catholic World*, "that inspiration extends only to matters of faith and morals, and to whatever else, including facts, has reference to faith and morals. This excludes from inspiration what Cardinal Newman has called *obiter dicta*, words, phrases, and sentences, which do not pertain to faith and morals." But let us hear what the Council of Trent holds. "The Council of Trent," says the "Manual of Catholic Theology," vol. i., p. 51, had declared that the whole of the books of the Old and New Testaments with all their parts were to be held as sacred and canonical." But if some "words, phrases, and sentences" were not inspired, they would be neither sacred nor canonical; and then the Council of Trent's declaration, "with all their parts," would be contradicted. "It is erroneous," continues the "Manual," "to assert that only certain portions of Scripture, for instance, matters of faith and morals or matters specially mentioned as revealed, are inspired. The Catholic doctrine is that the whole substance of the Sacred Writings has God for its author, and must be believed with divine faith." There is no place here for *obiter dicta*. "St. Thomas had taught long before that it was heresy to say that Holy Scripture is false, or to assert that a single point clearly contained in

it, e.g., that Samuel was the son of Elcana, is an error." ("Man. of Cath. Theol.," vol. i., p. 56.)

But let us suppose Canon Bartolo's views accepted and acted upon. How is he or any private individual to know that only what relates to faith and morals was inspired, that the so-called *obiter dicta* were not inspired? It belongs to the Church or its infallible Head to declare this, but she has rather declared the contrary, "that the whole of the books . . . with all their parts were to be held as sacred and canonical." If no private individual is free to interpret Scripture pertaining to faith and morals otherwise than as the Church interprets it, neither can he determine how much pertains to faith and morals, and how much does not. If he is incompetent for the one, he must be so likewise for the other.

But let us suppose this liberty granted, and see how Holy Scriptures will fare from it, now that each individual is free to leave out what seems to him not to appertain to faith or morals. Who will say what relation to faith or morals has a great part of the Apocalypse, whose interpretation has, to a great extent, baffled the ingenuity of the most learned in the Church, and of which St. Jerome says: "The Apocalypse has as many mysteries as words, or rather mysteries in every word?" And St. John ends it with these words: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city." Or will it be said that this threat, too, is among the *obiter dicta*, a mere fancy of the old man to frighten children and simple folks, but not to be heeded by strong minds enamored of freedom? Some may argue that much of the discourse of our Lord after the Last Supper, for instance His Prayer, has no connection with faith or morals, and may consequently be classed with *obiter dicta*. And surely the long account of the wanderings and shipwreck, and hair-breadth escapes of St. Paul, can have no bearing on the faith and morals of Christians; and how can the Epistle to Philemon, requesting him to forgive his fugitive slave, Onesimus, be other than *obiter dicta*? With this principle in hand, we can take as much from the Holy Bible as any free-thinking Protestant has ever taken. O Liberty! What havoc may be perpetrated in thy name!

"In case of conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in a matter of mixed jurisdiction, reason corroborated by faith will recognize, he (Bartolo) maintains, the distinct domains of the two powers, and will obey the competent authority within the limits of the power belonging to it; such obedience will be paid either to one of the two, or to both, within their respective jurisdictions." (*Catholic World*, October, 1890.)

This proposition seems to forget the words of our Lord, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and

love the other, or he will hold to the one and despise the other" (Luke xvi., 13); or the latter part of it forgets the former, "In case of conflict." If there is a conflict between the two powers, it is absolutely impossible to obey both. If we adhere to one of two contraries, we must reject the other. We cannot say yes and no to the same proposition. When there was a conflict between the two authorities, millions of martyrs went to death rather than obey the civil authorities. Our Lord said, "He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." In case of conflict, then, one must obey the ecclesiastical authorities. If obedience will be rendered "to both within their respective jurisdictions," this is evident proof that there is no conflict between them. The Church enjoins upon all the faithful the strict obligation of rendering obedience to all lawful authority, civil and ecclesiastical, within their respective jurisdictions; and as this is a moral obligation, it belongs to him who is infallible in what pertains to faith and morals to determine the limits of both jurisdictions. When the civil authorities in Germany, some years ago, pushed their jurisdiction beyond its just limits, the Catholics, to a man, disobeyed the civil authorities; and now the civil authorities themselves are approving their disobedience by retracing their own steps and, as far as they can, undoing what they did. A Christian is not free to determine for himself to what extent he will obey one or other of the authorities or both. If there is no conflict between them, it is determined already; he must obey both. If there is a conflict, he must hear his divinely appointed guide in faith and morals, the Church and her infallible Head.

Canon Bartolo's "demand for liberty from the encroachments of private theologians, setting themselves up as censors of their brethren," comes hard against himself, who is a private theologian censuring the free opinion that does not take so wide a course as his. We that are not theologians will take the liberty denied to them, and ask who is the encroacher, the new comer or the old possessor, the one who broaches strange opinions, or those who hold what has been held throughout the centuries by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church? If he is free to minimize the domain of *necessary things* in which unity is required, we are free to minimize that of *doubtful things* in which there is liberty of opinion. And if he censures us for our free opinion, that we are to believe much, he cannot complain of our censuring him for his free opinion that we are to believe little. If he acts the censor, we but follow his example. The advocate of freedom, he denies his own doctrine by constituting himself the censor of free opinion. But let us remember our motto, *In omnibus caritas*.

There is one free opinion expressed on page 119 of the *Catholic World*, to which those whom it may concern might lawfully offer

a free opinion to the contrary, and that, too, in perfect charity. "Nothing so ill-becomes learned orthodoxy as disregard for the sensibilities of honest but unenlightened Christians; this may be called the stupidity of learning. To this vicious union of erudition in doctrine and stupidity in teaching is sometimes joined a cruel contempt for the weaknesses of the little ones of Christ, and this is the criminal pride of learned orthodoxy."

We are fortunate in being orthodox without being learned. But not all learned orthodoxy is proud, nor is all criminal pride confined to learned orthodoxy. All orthodoxy must be intolerant of error, as all truth is; and this intolerance is perfectly consistent with charity. No man has a right to be offended at a simple, plain and strong statement of truth. This is a homage due to truth, and he is not worthy to possess it who is not ready to pay this homage when there is question of religious truth, or the truths of faith. St. Paul charges Timothy: "Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke with all patience and doctrine." There is no caution here not to hurt the "sensibilities" of his hearers.

"Would that Catholics of narrow views, and devoid of scientific gifts," writes Canon Bartolo, "learned how to respect in discussion the opinions of their brethren." And would, say we, that Catholics of broad views, and *chock-full* (!) of scientific gifts, learned how to respect in discussion the narrower views of their brethren. The broad views are not infallible any more than the narrow views, and yet, while pleading for charity and forbearance, we hear the broad views style the narrow views as "the insolence of theologians who would impose their doctrines upon man," while the theologians themselves disclaim any such imposition. It is not insolence at all in Canon Bartolo to try to impose his doctrines (views) upon men.

Again his own words come against him: "The private theologian who seeks to impose his views upon others without the guarantee of infallible authority assails liberty, and makes it impossible for the human understanding to possess itself of the truth; he is guilty of treason against humanity." A private theologian himself, without the guarantee of infallible authority, he tries to curtail the liberty of orthodox theologians, even to the extent of having them connive at error, as the following extract will show: "This theological process extends to the interpretation in a Catholic sense of expressions which are capable of a heterodox meaning. There can be no doubt that the science of theology demands precision of language, as does every other science—exactness of expression and reasoning; but among the most orthodox theological conceptions an inexact idea will often slip in, one which an orthodox theologian cannot, after mature consideration, accept.

On such accidental ideas the theologian of good sense will by no means fix his attention, or rather he will give them an orthodox interpretation, knowing, as he does, the soundness of his colleague's orthodoxy. . . . To call in question the faith of such a theologian, or to refuse him the praise due to the merit of his treatise, besides being a fault against charity, may have the effect of so frightening him off as to destroy the fruitfulness of his intelligence, or, at least, to render it sterile, turning him away from researches which he has undertaken in the field of divine science."

He wants the orthodox theologian who, after mature consideration, cannot accept certain ideas, to pay no attention to these heterodox ideas, but "rather give them an orthodox interpretation;" and with these heterodox ideas he must know "the soundness of his colleague's orthodoxy." How can a man's orthodoxy be sound, if his ideas are heterodox? And why should he give an orthodox interpretation to ideas which, after mature consideration, he cannot accept as orthodox? In every science a person is at *liberty* to expose the inexactness of a writer's ideas; nay, is expected to do it, for the sake of that science to which he devotes himself. It is only in theology, the queen of the sciences, that a man must pass over a writer's erroneous ideas, and "to refuse him the praise due to the merit of his treatise" is "a fault against charity." The Holy Scriptures tell us: "Praise not a man before he is dead." And why praise a treatise having in it heterodox ideas? It deserves no praise. The one who charitably points out the errors (just what Canon Bartolo does not want) renders it possible for the author to receive praise, on condition that he corrects the errors. Canon Bartolo should speak *ex cathedra* before men will believe it uncharitable in an orthodox theologian to point out what is heterodox in the writings of a fellow-theologian. "Frighten him off!" If he has not the humility to hear his errors exposed, and love of truth enough to correct them, and gratitude for the favor of exposing them, the sooner he is frightened off the better for himself and for mankind at large. The world has enough of erroneous opinions already, without "the fruitfulness of his intelligence" giving it still more. Better his intelligence be sterile than productive of error, and that he turn himself to something more suited to his capacity than pursue "the researches which he has undertaken in the field of divine science." That field will be all the more productive of the good grain of truth the more it is weeded of such incompetent workmen. This receives additional force from the fact that they will not have their works purged of their errors.

B. B.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—Canon Bartolo's book has been placed on the Index by the Sacred Congregation of the Index; and the same Sacred Congregation informs us that he received the condemnation with due submission.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

NO. I. DESTINY—PREPARATION.

IT is an auspicious year, which now dawns upon a world already predisposed to recognize the grandeur and appreciate the value of the achievements and services rendered to mankind by one whose memory has waited four hundred years for the full measure of human justice. Christopher Columbus, discoverer of a New World, was the most fortunate and the most unfortunate of men. It is difficult to say which was the greater, his glory or his sorrow. A gladsome thing it is that now his misfortunes exist only in history; the future is one of unalloyed benediction. While nations honor his memory and sovereigns come together to proclaim his exalted virtues and transcendent services, a nation, whose country he revealed to mankind, and which would be proud to bear his name, offers a national homage at his shrine, and now great cities become monumental with his memorials. Literature, too, embalms the hero's name and deeds in choicest forms of poetry, history, drama and panegyric, while every journal, review and magazine published in this favored land will signalize the quarto-centennial year with fervid tributes to the great discoverer. This REVIEW will cordially unite in the universal acclaim, and will make its issues of 1892 so many grateful souvenirs of the discoverer of America.

Christopher Columbus was a man of destiny. Not that he was destined from eternity by an invincible and inexorable necessity to be the discoverer of the new world, so that no other man could possibly achieve that grand result; but that he was so fitted for the task, so pre-eminently endowed with the virtues and knowledge and courage necessary to its accomplishment, that he saw so clearly in himself the man that was to attain this great result, comprehended it and dedicated himself unchangeably to it so ardently, that, in the natural order at least, he was the man destined to perform the act. He came to know and feel assured so well of his destined part on earth, that from an early time in his life he drew such inspiration from the altar of prayer and grace, it was evident

"Thither he
Will come to know his destiny."—*Shakespeare.*

But Christopher Columbus was the man of destiny in a higher sense, in that he was a providential man, one destined, in the mer-

ciful designs of Providence, to reveal the New World to the Old, to carry the Cross over the trackless ocean to unknown peoples, and to bring Christendom face to face with the heathen tribes and nations of the earth. Columbus regarded himself as the chosen one of God for the fulfillment of great undertakings. After his third voyage, and while awaiting, in Spain, the authority and sanction of Ferdinand and Isabella for undertaking his fourth voyage, he prepared a most remarkable work, entitled "Collection of Prophecies Concerning the Recovery of Jerusalem and the Discovery of the Indies (America)," in which he applied, with great acumen, learning and logic, to the New World and to himself, many of the ancient prophecies of the Old Testament. That learned Italian publicist, Francisco Tarducci (Mr. Brownson's English translation), referring to the letter addressed by the admiral to the Spanish sovereigns, and accompanying the "Collection of Prophecies" which he sent to them, writes: "He freely asserted his conviction that he had been chosen by God, *from his earliest years*, to carry out these two great undertakings—the discovery of the New World and the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. For this purpose God had led him to embrace a sailor's life, in which one is naturally inclined to study to penetrate the secrets of nature, and he had, in addition, a spirit of curiosity which caused him to read every sort of chronicles and books of philosophy. While meditating on these books, his mind had been opened by God 'as by a hand,' and it was then that he discovered a way by sea to the Indies, and felt himself all on fire with the desire of opening it. 'Then it was,' he says, 'that I sought Your Majesties. Every one that heard of my undertaking ridiculed it; all the knowledge I had acquired was of no use to me. I spent ten years at your august court in discussions with persons of great merit and profound learning, who, after much argument, ended by declaring my projects to be chimerical. Your Majesties alone had faith and constancy. Who can doubt that it was the light derived from the Sacred Scriptures that enlightened your minds with the same rays as mine?'" In this same letter, so remarkable and characteristic of the man, he alleges the wondrous methods of the Holy Ghost in guiding the minds of the chosen instruments of Providence in the knowledge of their vocations and in the means of their accomplishment. He learnedly and ably sets forth definite canons for interpreting the sacred Scriptures, based upon the writings of St. Augustine, St. Thomas, St. Isidore and Gerson. He based the arguments of his extraordinary discourse upon the divine assurance that "before the consummation of the world all that has been written shall be fulfilled." He then presents *seriatim*, and with great cogency, the grand chain of prophecies relating, as he contended,

to the two great aspirations of his life, the Discovery of the New World and the Redemption of the Holy Land, and follows these up with an elaborate and cogent series of reasonings sustained by arguments, logical propositions, interpretations and citations of authorities of sacred writers, and especially from the Fathers of the Church. When this extraordinary document, in the preparation of which it is said he was aided by a learned ecclesiastical and theological sympathizer and friend, was completed, the author sent it for revision and correction to Father Gaspare Goricio, a Carthusian monk of Seville famous for his theological learning. The accomplished and astute theologian returned the document to its illustrious author, with answer that he found nothing to correct and nothing to add to it, and expressing himself with wonder at its learning and research and with praise for its piety and devotion. Columbus entertained these sentiments to the end of his life, for in the most solemn act of his life, his last will and testament, he devoutly commences with these words: "In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, who inspired me with the idea, and afterwards made it perfectly clear to me, that I should navigate and go to the Indies from Spain, by traversing the ocean westwardly." The same sentiments are reiterated in many of the letters and writings of the admiral. This was certainly the inspiration that carried him through so many obstacles, trials, disasters and misfortunes to success and glory.

But it was not he alone that entertained these sentiments. Many of his contemporaries and many learned historians of subsequent periods and of our own times have fully sympathized with them. It is well known that Columbus addressed several letters to the Sovereign Pontiffs on the subject of his discoveries and the consequent crusade for the delivery of the Holy Land, in which he always alluded to his providential and apostolic mission, and it is a well-established fact that he received repeated and renewed encouragement from Rome. It is now one of the movements in honor of the approaching Columbian celebrations, that our present Holy Father has appointed a learned scholar and theologian near his person to collect from the Vatican archives and publish the proofs that it was owing in a great measure to the assurances, encouragements and benedictions of the Holy See that Columbus was sustained and inspired with hope and perseverance to prosecute his great work to such glorious and successful results, and that the chief motive that inspired Columbus was an ardent zeal for the conversion of heathen nations to Christianity. Some of the facts on this head will be given by us hereafter.

So also in his own days there were many other learned and pious ecclesiastics and laymen, who united with him in the belief that he

held a special mission from Divine Providence to reveal to mankind the existence of the New World. Amongst his sympathizers were eminent persons of different countries—persons of high birth, distinguished rank and rare abilities. The learned and famous scientist and lapidary, Jayme Ferrer, whom Isabella herself had introduced to Columbus, only voiced the sentiments of many other learned and pious scholars and Christians of his day when, in his letter to the queen on January 27, 1495, he thus referred to Columbus: "I believe that in its deep, mysterious designs, Divine Providence selected him as its agent in this work, which I look upon as the introduction and preparation of things which the same Divine Providence has determined to make known to us for its own glory and the salvation and happiness of the world." And, on August 5th of the same year, he thus addresses Columbus himself: "I behold in this a great mystery; divine and infallible Providence sent the great Thomas (the apostle) from the west to the east to preach our Holy Catholic faith in the Indies, and has sent you, Señor, by the opposite way, from the east to the west, till, by God's will, you reached the utmost limits of Upper India, in order that the inhabitants might learn those truths, which their progenitors cared not to receive from the preaching of St. Thomas. And thus are fulfilled the words of the prophet: 'Their sound is gone out through all the earth.'" And again in the same letter: "In your mission, Señor, you seem an apostle, a messenger of God, to spread His name in unknown lands." The great and learned Agostino Giustiniani, in his famous Polyglot Psalter, sustains the opinion of Jayme Ferrer as to the divine mission of Columbus; and Father Ventura said, "Columbus is the man of the Church."

Our own gifted and eloquent countryman, Washington Irving, writes in strains of respect, if not of sympathy, of this profoundly religious and confiding view which Columbus so honestly took and so fervently felt in the heaven-inspired mission which he was sent to perform. "These ideas," he says, "so repeatedly and solemnly and artlessly expressed by a man of the fervent piety of Columbus show how truly his discovery arose from the working of his own mind, and not from information furnished by others. He considered it a divine intimation, a light from heaven, and the fulfilment of what had been foretold by our Saviour and the prophets. Still, he regarded it as a minor event, preparatory to the great enterprise, the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He pronounced it a miracle effected by heaven to animate himself and others to that holy undertaking, and he assured the sovereigns that if they had faith in his present as in his former proposition, they would be assuredly rewarded with equally triumphant success. He conjured them not to heed the sneers of such

as might scoff at him as one unlearned, as an ignorant mariner, a worldly man, reminding them that the Holy Spirit works not merely in the learned, but also in the ignorant. And then, after showing how much the religious views and proposals of Columbus were consonant with the sentiments and convictions of the times and of the country in which he lived, the accomplished author proceeds to say: "There was nothing, therefore, in the proposition of Columbus that could be regarded as preposterous, considering the period and circumstances in which it was made, though it strongly illustrates his own enthusiastic and visionary character. It must be recollected that it was meditated in the courts of the Alhambra, among the splendid remains of Moorish grandeur, where, but a few years before, he had beheld the standard of the faith elevated in triumph above symbols of infidelity. It appears to have been the offspring of one of those moods of high excitement, when, as has been observed, his soul was elevated by the contemplation of his great and glorious office; when he considered himself under divine inspiration, imparting the will of Heaven, and fulfilling the high and holy purposes for which he had been predestined."

The very names which our hero bore from his infancy have been regarded as evidences of his Christian Apostolate; Colombo, a Dove; and Christopher, the Christ-Bearer. He has been compared to the prophets and patriarchs of old, and many points of resemblance have been discovered between them. He has been compared with Moses, who, fifteen hundred years before the advent of Christ gave a law to the oppressed people of God, led them out of the land of bondage, instructed them in the true religion and worship of God, and consolidated and isolated them from the contamination of idolatry; Columbus in like manner and like another Moses, fifteen hundred years after the coming of the Saviour, extended the boundaries of the known earth, restored the union and brotherhood of all men, and enlarged the realms of Christendom. Even Columbus himself likened himself unto Moses and to David. Like Moses his name was highly symbolic; both were forty years of age when they commenced the execution of their respective missions, which they received from the same God; and both left wife and family heroically to do the will of God with perfection. While the sea opened to give Moses and his followers a safe passage over, the great ocean, "the Sea of Darkness," smoothed its tempestuous bosom and became calm and pleasant for the Christ-Bearer to reach the New World he was seeking. While Moses promulgated the Law of the Covenant, Columbus announced that of the New Testament, and while the former prophetically appealed to the sign of the Cross on the

post in the form of the Greek letter *Tau*, Columbus triumphed by the Cross, which he emblazoned on his banners, erected with huge trees cut from the virgin forests wherever he landed, and which he bore on his breast; Moses received the ingratitude, the opposition, the violence of his people, while the inheritance of Columbus were desertion, destitution, revolts, chains, imprisonment, calumnies, obscurity and neglect. While Moses was denied the privilege of entering the promised land, Columbus never saw the Indies nor Asia, which he sought, knew not the very Continent which he discovered; and the very world which he revealed, received its name from another.

The Rev. Arthur George Knight, of the Society of Jesus in England, opens his beautiful and learned "Life of Columbus" with that devout and favorite prayer of the great admiral:

Jesu cum Maria
Sit nobis in via.

From his intelligent and fervid pages we can but learn how powerfully Columbus grasped the fundamental truth that the actions of men have their meaning and value from reference to the life of God Incarnate; he saw in his own name, the Christ-Bearer, a symbol of his work; how Columbus, in his famous vision, received a message from God, a solemn admonition, and the restoration of his energies, at the moment they were most needed, on the eve of his shipwreck; and how the vicissitudes of a life of peril, his repeated rescues from the jaws of death, constitute a standing miracle of a special Providence visibly exerted in his behalf.

The tendency of modern writers, those who belong to non-Catholic schools, is to regard the life and achievements of Columbus as the mere results of human genius and courage, great and invaluable though they are, as the splendid development and successful execution of theories long entertained, and by him for the first time visibly applied, without any recognition of a providential mission, or divine vocation. Even the sympathetic Mr. Irving reveals insuperable aversion to recognize anything providential in the life of Columbus, while he acknowledges that the admiral's belief in his own divine mission furnished him the chief motive, and inward stimulus to face every danger and suffering in executing his self-recognized divine vocation. So, too, Mr. Winsor, of Boston, in his work on Columbus which will have been published before this article reaches the readers of the REVIEW, treats the whole achievement of the discovery of America as the successful and brilliant culmination of a theory recognizing the sphericity of the earth, which had been first broached six hundred years before Christ, and which Columbus was the first

of philosophers and scientists to put into visible and tangible realization. He strings the whole history of the discovery of the New World upon a faint tradition among a learned few, dim in origin, scarcely discernible in centuries, with here and there a slight recognition, accepted by few if any, and finally discarded by the learned generally, and by the entire mass of mankind. Columbus, on the other hand, felt his mind enlightened from on high, his steps guided by divine Providence, a religious support and ever-flowing renewal of strength and resources under the most appalling difficulties and misfortunes, a perseverance under unparalleled denials, delays, obstructions, and injustices, which we can but recognize, as he did, to be a supernatural grace. The Count de Lorgues takes a higher view when he states that, "Columbus possessed, visibly, the three theological virtues; he practiced constantly the four cardinal virtues; the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost were apparent in his life, and we find God admirable in him, as He is always in His Saints." And again this Christian writer says, "Evidently God chose Christopher Columbus as a Messenger of Salvation."

It is undeniable, indeed it is a grand and luminous feature in his extraordinary and unparalleled career, that he felt the inadequacy of human resources to sustain himself under the ordeal through which he had to pass; he was frequently on the point of utter failure and collapse, at one time engulfed in a deep lethargy, at another shipwrecked, and at another sick unto death, and in every crisis he felt and recognized in his recovery the direct hand of a superintending and sustaining Providence. Columbus believed in his own providential mission, and it was this belief which carried him onward to the most glorious success. This is the key to a proper understanding of his life and character, the selection of characteristic features in his life, the motive-power of a splendid career. From this it will be seen how important, how necessary, it is for us to present this point in some detail, for now, as we are about to commence the more historic part of our treatise, the historian cannot but recognize as we proceed with his glory, how every circumstance, fact, apparent accident, and every surrounding of the man from his birth, evidently seemed to unite in preparing him for what he persistently avowed was his providential call and divine mission. It would be impossible to comprehend the life of Columbus in any other light than that which is shed by his own thoughts, aspirations, prayers, visions and avowed impulses and resources. Without this recognition his life is an enigma. It is true that he was a profound student of science and of nature, and that he followed scientific methods; but why was it that other scientists, even more learned than he, could never undertake or accomplish the

great discovery ; why were they all astonished and incredulous at his theories and still more at his achievements ? Again, it was not the learning of Columbus, nor his scientific attainments, that met the real difficulties of his crucified life ; it was the strength of his faith, the force of his religious hope, the power of his prayer, the virtues of his character, his incessant appeals to heaven, his recognition of a providential mission, his obedience to the divine call, the whole moral and devout momentum of his pious personality, that enabled him to practice an unparalleled perseverance under unequalled difficulties and disasters, to overcome every social, moral and political obstacle, to meet even the conscientious but mistaken objections of devout churchmen and divines, to bear or overcome the insults, intrigues, malice and calumnies of his enemies, and to be silent under the ingratitude of his own sovereign. It can be noticed by the intelligent and gentle reader, that Providence from his birth and throughout his manhood, as we detail his singular and fascinating history, surrounded him by the circumstances which prepared him, both as an apostle and as a scientist for the successful accomplishment of his great mission on earth. What was his preparation for his mission ? The history of the first half of his life will show.

Although a fierce contest has been waged among historians and scholars as to the precise place of birth of Christopher Columbus, now the struggle has been definitely decided in favor of the proud city of Genoa, Genoa the Magnificent. This beautiful city had sprung from the sea, derived its support from the sea, and its glory was drawn from the sea ; a city almost cut off from the inland and from the pursuits of the land by a chain of high mountains surrounding it in the rear, whilst its majestic palaces, temples, fortifications and noble streets turned incessantly towards the water, and looking across the graceful semi-circle of the harbor, intuitively schooled its gallant men and agile youth to look ardently and ambitiously to the sea. The Genoese were essentially and from necessity a maritime people

"Whose ready sails, with every wind can fly
And make cov'nant with the inconstant sky ;
Whose oaks secure as if they there took root,
Who tread on billows with a steady foot."—*Waller.*

The ordinary life of a Genoese was commenced from early youth and spent on the water. It was a daily school for fascinating danger and bold adventure. Particularly was this the case at the time of the birth and boyhood of Columbus. For while long controversies were carried on by critics and biographers as to the time of his birth ; this question has been settled in favor of the year of

grace, 1436. At this period of time it was, as had been the case for centuries, when the battles of Christian Europe against the Turks and Mussulmen, when struggles of merchantmen on the high seas with outlaws and corsairs, when incessant broils and contests with the Mediterranean pirates, fired the hearts and aroused the ambition of every spirited and generous Genoese youth. The atmosphere which young Columbus breathed, the stirring tales of maritime adventure which the aged and retired sailors then told beneath the vines that crowned the neighboring hills, and in the vineyards tilled by veteran retired tars, which formed the traditional literature of his youth, the daily sight of gallant fleets of men-of-war and armed merchantmen going out the majestic harbor to join in the dangerous fray or glorious battle, the very sight of sea and smell of salt, the ozone of the ocean, and the seafaring heredity sucked in with his mother's milk, the very school books all historic of battle and illustrated with naval contests, all united to inspire the mind and heart of Christopher Columbus with a love of the water from his infancy. The providence, whose call to mighty deeds and sublime achievements he obeyed in after life, could not have cast his youthful lot in a school more fitted to form the character of the future discoverer of worlds. The generous boy was equal to his opportunities—for he was a precocious sailor, and made his first voyage to sea at the age of fourteen.

But there was another training, deeper and more beneficent which Columbus received during the first fourteen years of his life, which ran parallel with his seafaring aspirations, which girded his loins and his soul with the armor of faith, purity, and virtue, and which made him first the Christian sailor, then the Christian discoverer, admiral, and apostle. He was the son of Domenico Columbus and Susana Fontanarossa. The Italian form of the name was Colombo, which signified a dove. His parents were in humble circumstances, though not destitute, and it is confidently stated that his ancestors belonged to the nobility. His father followed the trade of a wool comber, and when his family had grown to number four sons, Christopher, the oldest, Bartholomew, Pellegrino, and James, and one daughter, he prudently rented out his own house and took the lease of another and humbler home, No. 166 Mulcento street, having the Benedictines as his landlords and his neighbors. The oldest of the sons of Domenico Colombo was baptized soon after his birth in the ancient Benedictine church of St. Stephen, which as a venerable relic is pointed out to this day to reverent tourists, and here the future admiral received the highly symbolical name of Christopher, the Christ Bearer, a name which was truly prophetic of the brilliant services he was to render in after life to the Christ, the Incarnate, the Redeemer, the Saviour.

Christopher and his brothers assisted the good and pious father in his trade as a wool comber, in which also he had hired assistance and an apprentice. But Domenico Colombo did not claim the entire services of his oldest son at the shop, but made every effort to give him an education in keeping with his conspicuous and rare abilities. After bestowing upon him some elementary instruction, he sent him at the tender age of ten years to the University of Pavia. At this gentle age, and at this famous university, the oldest son of the Colombos studied the elements of mathematics, physics, astronomy, Latin, and mental and moral philosophy, for such were the studies for which this noted school was famous, and such too were the principal attainments of Christopher Columbus, until, in the working out of his world-wide career, he added navigation and seamanship. While it is not claimed that Christopher mastered these studies, the fact of his spending two years at the university shows the precocity of his mind and points out the providence that gave a scientific trend to his mind and life. At the age of twelve he returned to his father's shop and to the labors of a wool comber. It was during these years that he received the Sacraments of Confirmation, which made him through life a soldier of the Cross, and of the Holy Eucharist, by which he became in fact, as in name, the Bearer of the Christ. The family of Colombo had an excellent name for honesty, virtue and intelligence. Their ancestral traditions, running back to noble blood in Lombardy, Piedmont, the Plaisantin, and Liguria, preserved the striking virtues and loyalty of the Middle Ages, and these qualities were perpetuated at the humble fireside of the wool comber of Genoa.

Various authors have discussed the interesting question as to the nature and extent of Columbus' education when he embraced a seafaring life at the age of fourteen. While some have limited his attainments to the elements of grammar and arithmetic, others have credited him with elementary studies in science, and with finally, as years passed on, an entire devotion to the science of navigation. His son Fernando, his historian, making the most of the slender fact that he studied at Pavia, with justice claims for his father the additional accomplishments of astronomy and geometry, geography, cosmography, and drawing. It is claimed that already he was fond of reading works on cosmography, and that he even then commenced drawing maps, which in after life proved his only protection from hunger and nakedness. He claims, therefore, that he was a student at the University of Pavia, which many others have doubted or denied. It is certain, however, that the University of Pavia has, in recent years, erected a monument to commemorate its own honorable association with Columbus as one of

its students, and Monsignor Rocco Cocchia, who had the glory of finding the remains of Columbus at San Domingo, sent a portion of them to the University of Pavia, in recognition of its claim to be the Alma Mater of the admiral.

It is to be regretted that this seafaring life of Columbus, from the time of his embarking as a sailor about the year 1449, when fourteen years old, to the year 1470, when he arrived in Portugal at the age of thirty-five, is involved in so much obscurity. That he was a youth of piety and faith, of integrity and truth, of energy and fidelity, is well known from the facts that these qualities naturally formed the training of a youth fresh from the shrine of a good Catholic home, and that he preserved his purity and devout character through the dangerous ordeal of twenty years or more of seafaring life, and at Lisbon, in the prime of life, he was a man of profound faith, tender piety and religious zeal. This was a rare and precious inheritance to preserve through such a life as a sailor and a naval officer, in those times especially, and in those countries, he was compelled to lead. It was a life of danger, hardships, and suffering, one of daring adventure, of exciting risk, of rude and reckless encounter, of danger to health and limb, and of constant peril to life. A sailor's companions and friends were as reckless and desperate as the enemies he had to encounter, and the danger of becoming like unto them was imminent. His first service as a sailor, humble and laborious, exposed him to the violence of tempests and of the waves, to the dangers of battle and personal encounter, to wounds, privations, suffering, and exposures of every kind. The conditions of the times, that turbulent and reckless period, show what must have been the life of Christopher Columbus for a period of twenty years. The numerous States along the Mediterranean, and especially those of Italy, were turbulent in their habits and reckless in their careers; each one seemed to be at perpetual war with its neighbors; alliances were sometimes formed of several weaker ones against a more powerful neighbor; treachery and intrigue were freely resorted to, and piracy was openly practised and universally licensed. The high seas became the theatre of perpetual warfare, the ships of each petty state were constantly engaged in chase or battle with those of a neighboring state. They depredated like pirates on each other's commerce; piracy supplanted commerce, and no ship afloat was ever at rest or at peace. Fleets of privateers roamed the sea in search of booty or adventure, and were ready to enter the service of any belligerent or adventurer that provided the richest plunder, the most thrilling service, or the most reckless fighting. Petty lords or chieftains maintained fleets of their own, under pretense of defending their domains,

but ready at any moment to avenge an offence real or imaginary, to pounce upon richly laden merchantmen, or to take part in any public or private war. The danger to which merchantmen were constantly exposed, from the practice of universal piracy, caused them to carry armaments and fighting equipments like men-of-war. To this lawless state of the sea, among the maritime States of Europe, was added the incessant appearance on these scenes of blood, pillage, and death, of Mahometan corsairs and fleets of infidels, bent on destroying all they encountered and putting to the sword every Christian antagonist; and this feature in the tumultuous state of the seafaring life added danger and zest to the life they led, and was accompanied by the rancor and woes of religious strife and race extermination. Such was the stirring school in which Columbus was trained to be a sailor, a seaman, a navigator, a commander, a future discoverer. We have no details of this formative and preparative period of his life. We know, however, that at the age of twenty-four, he had reached the rank of a captain, and commanded a ship in the service of Jean of Anjou, who, with the aid of France, was struggling to assert his sovereignty over the kingdom of Naples against Alfonso V. of Aragon. Genoa took sides with Jean of Anjou and Charles VII. of France, and a combined fleet of French, Neapolitan and Genoese, for four years spread terror among the squadrons of Aragon. It was in 1459 that Columbus became an active participant in the war, and from his own pen we learn how he bore himself in the personal service, the special commission, and in the chase confided to him by his chief. "King René happened to send me to Tunis to capture the galley Fernandina; and arriving at the head of the island of San Pietro in Sardinia, I learned that there were two ships and a carrac with the galley. At this my crew were so troubled that they determined to proceed no further, but to return to Marseilles for another vessel and more men. Seeing that I had no other means of forcing them, I pretended to yield to their wishes, and altered the point of the compass, and spread sail, it being then evening. The next morning at sunrise, we found ourselves off Carthage, while all were firmly convinced we were sailing towards Marseilles." This incident shows the characteristic courage of Columbus in seeking an encounter with a force three times greater than his own, a courage for which he was distinguished through life, and to which he owed much of his success. The stratagem, by which he forced his timid crew to meet the foe against their will, casts light upon another and more pregnant and perilous and glorious period of his life and successful career, when, in his first Atlantic voyage, that resulted in the discovery of America, he altered the reckoning of the distance from Spain, and thus held his

panic-stricken crews to the westward course, and to ultimate success, and imperishable renown.

Not only was it claimed in behalf of Columbus, especially by his son and historian, Fernando Columbus, that his ancestors were of noble estate and blood, but it was also claimed that he was a near relative and comrade on sea, and in the naval service, of two distinguished admirals of his own name, Colombo the Elder and Colombo the Younger, who were uncle and nephew. This claim is not without probable foundation, though Tarducci and other authors have thrown doubts upon parts of the story. Most authors, including Mr. Irving, give the account as authentic. That the two Admirals Colombo were active and bold leaders in the wars of the Mediterranean when Columbus was a young naval officer, and that he served gallantly under the banner of at least the Younger Colombo, and took part with him in a bloody encounter of the French fleet with the Venetian ships, is undoubted. Our admiral has himself, moreover, given authority to the claim of relationship with these noted admirals by a passage in one of his most famous letters—one which he addressed from the New World to a distinguished lady, the governess of the Infanta, Don Juan of Castile. "I am not the first admiral of my family," wrote Columbus; and then, as if despising all earthly pride and honor, and clinging only to his providential and divine mission, he likened himself unto David, and continued: "Let them give me what name they will for, in fine, David, the wise king, was a shepherd, and became King of Jerusalem, and I serve the same Lord who raised him to such high estate." These aspirations of the son and family of Columbus affect his position in history and before the world but little, since he won for himself, by his own genius and achievements, a patent of nobility and a rank in naval records higher and more glorious than the most famous admirals of naval history.

In 1470 Christopher Columbus commenced a career more pregnant of good to the world and of glory to himself than all the battles and victories which the historic waters of the Mediterranean could have ever witnessed, even in the days of classic Greece or imperial Rome. This was when he entered Portugal, and took up his residence at Lisbon, then the central and focal spot, where the science of navigation, the energy and thirst of adventure and discovery, the brilliant achievements of illustrious naval leaders, and the grand incentives to chivalrous and scientific deeds and service on the ocean culminated, and astonished the world. We have two accounts of the manner and motive of his going to Portugal. One represents him as having been engaged off the coast of that country in one of the most terrible and sanguinary battles of that warlike age, in which the hostile ships came together in

mortal encounter, were grappled and chained together, and the officers and crews met each other on the bloody decks in general struggle and in single combat, when suddenly a destructive fire swept across the struggling fleets, involving the combatants on both sides in dangers more terrific than human war. Columbus is said to have seized an oar, providentially cast in his way, and by its aid to have reached the shores of Portugal, and thence, assisted by public charity—such was now his poverty—travelled to the capital, awaiting the next turn in the wheel of fortune. If this be so, the hand of Providence threw in his way a ready passage from disaster and death to the initial approaches towards glory and immortality. Tarducci favors this account. At Lisbon he met many friends and congenial spirits, and among them his noble and devoted brother, Bartholomew.

But it seems to us more probable, and we believe, with Fernando Columbus, the admiral's son and historian, without discrediting the story of his shipwreck, that he was a voluntary seeker of this great rendezvous for navigators, cosmographers, seamen and leaders of the marine, scientists, geographers and discoverers. That he was drawn thither by the congenial air and sympathetic society of men, who, like himself, were bent on grand conceptions, useful explorations and practical discoveries. The Genoese boy, who, at the age of twelve and fourteen, had studied the great cosmographical authors, and had turned his talent for drawing to the delineations of the earth, could not have spent twenty years in active maritime service among distinguished admirals, experienced navigators and veteran voyagers, without an observant appreciation of all he saw, a careful study of the sea which he loved so much, and an intense inquiry into the causes which for centuries had left the earth so unexplored and its known limits so restricted. The same causes, which had for some years attracted to Lisbon the aspiring and energetic men of the maritime professions, most naturally operated on the mind and heart of the most intelligent, the most logical, the most profound and the bravest of them all. What other centre was there of maritime energy and enterprise than Lisbon for the future discoverer of the New World to make his headquarters? This very question, as to the motives which impelled the steps of Columbus towards Lisbon, assuming, as we now do, that it was the desire of maritime adventure, development and discovery, and the congenial pursuits of its court, king and people, makes this the proper point for the consideration of another more interesting and pregnant question—one of paramount attraction and fascination—When did the great admiral first conceive the thought, the inspiration, the providential mission, that there was another and unknown world, and that he was the chosen instrument of heaven for its discovery?

This question is involved in great obscurity, owing to, first, the active and engrossing life which Columbus led from the age of fourteen to the age of thirty-four, when he entered Portugal, and the consequent absence of any correspondence or record of his thoughts, studies or plans; and, second, the comparatively obscure and modest life he led in Lisbon up to the time of his public announcement of his proposals. It is certain that Columbus had his convictions, theories and proposals all brought to completion and formal arrangement by the year 1474, as we shall see hereafter from his correspondence with the celebrated cosmographer of Florence, Dr. Toscanelli. But how much sooner?

He arrived in Lisbon in 1470 (Mr. Winsor makes it 1473), and soon thereafter, either in that year or in 1471, he must have lived in Porto Santo, and there are rumors and charges of his having learned from an old pilot of the existence of land in the western ocean during his residence there. It was frequently reported, and even charged, that he knew the secret, and kept it as such for some time before he communicated it to Dr. Toscanelli or the King of Portugal. While the specific accusation has been proved to be unfounded, its existence is proof of a belief that he then knew the theory and fact. Mr. Irving proves that the whole thought originated exclusively in his own mind, and such assuredly was the case. But under any circumstances, so vast and profound a study and discovery, such an intricate and complicated system of reasonings, so much knowledge, observation, experience and research, such vast reading and study of voluminous works, such a fixed and definite view and conviction, such elaborate preparation, such vastness of detail and proof, such a well-arranged, studied and elaborated series of scientific and practical propositions, could never have been the fruits of a few years, but must have been the results of a lifetime of laborious application. At the age of fourteen he had studied cosmography and kindred sciences, and as the gifted youth looked out from the mountains encircling his native Genoa, his gaze rested on the sea, and through this highway or channel he could but see the only means of solving the many cosmographical questions discussed in the books he read. It is not probable, or even possible, that his earliest thoughts reached so far as a theory of the existence of western lands; but the germ was laid in his early boyhood, and his mind rested not until the germ had burst forth and borne fruit in an early period of his life. From the moment of this conviction in his youthful mind his life's leisure and his early and late hours were devoted to study and the discovery and collection of proofs and authorities to sustain his convictions. While it is not in our power to fix the date when his grand conception took defi-

nite shape in his mind, he himself assures us, and thus proves from his own words, that it was from his earliest years; for in the letter which he addressed to the Spanish sovereigns, accompanying his book of prophecies, as Tarducci states, and as we have already quoted, "He freely asserted his conviction that he had been chosen by God, *from his earliest years*, to carry out these two great undertakings—the discovery of the New World and the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre." Thus *from his earliest years* the trend of his mind, study and convictions must have been in this channel, and must have resulted in an early decision.

Columbus, on his arrival at Lisbon, was in the prime of life, and was a noble type of manhood. He is described as of a tall stature, powerfully built and admirably proportioned, and was graceful, dignified and noble in his carriage and bearing. His face was somewhat oval, long, but not fat or thin, complexion bright and tending towards ruddy, his face receiving animation from numerous freckles; his nose was aquiline, eyes bright, and his jaws were slightly projecting. In his diet he was frugal, and in his dress plain, though exceedingly neat. While his manner was affable in conversation with strangers and mild with servants, he was naturally grave. His natural disposition was subject to anger, but this imperfection he had overcome by spiritual discipline and a strong will. He was ever charitable and just in his comments on others. But it was his religious character and practices, at this time in particular, and during his whole life, which especially challenges our admiration. He spent much time in prayer, observed the most rigid fasts, attended the holy Mass every day, and recited daily the whole canonical office of a religious. He began nothing in life without first devoutly saying the pious prayer we have already mentioned, *Jesu cum Maria Sit nobis in Via*. He was a devout client of the Blessed Virgin, and a great admirer and imitator of St. Francis of Assisium. The Franciscans, in turn, were his especial friends in life and in death. That a man should have preserved his purity of life and so pious and religious a character through twenty years of a seafaring life, amid such scenes of strife, and in the companionship of turbulent and often unscrupulous adventurers and leaders, is the strongest proof that Columbus was a vessel of election, a representative of the Most High, a man blending at once the character of the patriarch, the apostle, the missionary, the ambassador of the faith and the chosen one of Providence.

Columbus was a daily and devout attendant at holy Mass, and at Lisbon he was present every day most piously at the holy sacrifice offered in the Convent-Church of All Saints. Among the pious ladies attending the convent schools was one of his own race, Felipa Moñis de Perestrella, of Italian descent, and of a family dis-

tinguished in the maritime history of Portugal. Her father had been one of the earliest followers of Prince Henry the Navigator, and had achieved early discoveries in that service; and at his death, owing to the destructive plague of the rabbits in the island of Porto Santo, he had become impoverished; his fame and an unsullied honor were all he left to his family, with the exception of a small share or remnant of property on that island. The future discoverer made the acquaintance of Felipa, their association ripened into friendship, finally into a mutual attachment, and they were married. From the time of his arrival at Lisbon he supported himself by making geographical maps, an art he commenced to practice when a boy at Genoa. Now his mother-in-law became a member of his household at Lisbon, and at Porto Santo, where he soon after went to reside. Here his son and successor, Diego, was born, and here he continued the occupation of map making. So accomplished was he in this art that it proved sufficiently lucrative to enable him to support his family, and assist his aged father at Genoa, a filial duty he always performed with generosity, even in the most impoverished periods of his life. His studies of navigation, and the absorption of his thoughts in the great problem of the earth, must have led ultimately to his neglecting his maps and his charts, and to his consequent pecuniary embarrassment. We do not know when he became a widower. In the midst of his own poverty we find that he visited his venerable parents in 1472 and 1473, and always assisted them; and continued his visits until he became engaged in his voyages to the New World. It was about this time that he must have conversed with King Alfonso V., of Portugal on his magnificent projects, and it is argued from his visits to court and the free converse of the king with him, that he had emerged from his obscurity, and had won repute as a man of science, especially learned in cosmography and navigation. In one of his visits to the king, the latter showed to him some reeds of immense size, which had been cast upon the shores of the Azores by the waters of the Atlantic. This fact was afterwards referred to by the Admiral as evidence of the existence of land across the western ocean. Columbus was now surely in possession of his great theory; a theory, which at an early period, assumed the shape of assumed conviction.

The Portuguese had now become the foremost nation in maritime adventure, energy and enterprise, had undertaken with enlightened and brilliant policy and ability, the solution of the great problem of reaching Asia by sea, had selected for that achievement the route on the Atlantic Ocean southward along the coast of Africa, then south-eastwardly and turning the Cape of Good Hope, eastwardly to the empires of the Grand Khan, teeming with

millions of subjects, enriched with gold and spices and precious stones and the richest fabrics of an oriental overland commerce. Now they had achieved a substantial and honorable progress in approaching the golden land of Ophir, and the dazzling riches and uncounted millions of the vast empires of the East. From the remotest antiquity Africa had been an enigma to philosophers, scientists, navigators and cosmographers.

It was the dark Continent, whose eastern, western and southern boundaries were almost as unknown as its vast interior. All was mystery concerning the land of the burning sun, and the man of color; Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Venetians, Genoese, the French, had essayed the solution of the problem. Centuries had been vainly spent in these brave and costly attempts to explore a Continent. For forty years the Portuguese had become the pioneers in this long and then fruitless effort, and, under the leadership of Prince Henry the navigator, third son of King John I., of Portugal, and Grand Master of the Order of Christ, had triumphantly carried the Portuguese flag to the south as far as Cape Non and beyond it then to Cape Bojador and beyond even that. The Madeira Islands and the Cape Verde Islands had now become familiar to mariners. The discovery of Porto Santo by Perestrella, the father-in-law of Columbus, was like a new discovery of an old island; Portuguese colonies studded the islands of the Atlantic along the coast of Africa, and in 1442, Gileanez, a Portuguese captain, reached Cape da Gallee, 170 miles beyond Cape Bojador, and from the gold dust found called the place Rio d'Oro. Some of the most powerful princes of Africa had entered into treaties of friendship and commerce with the Portuguese. A gold mine discovered in Guinea was so promising in its anticipated yield of the precious metal that it received the distinguishing name of simply *The Mine*. Portugal, its court and its people were excited and most joyful over the brilliant achievements in African discovery, colonization and commerce. Lisbon, where Columbus now spent most of his time, was the central point of this zeal, energy and ambition for African expeditions; conversation at court, in the market-places, the homes and streets of the city, at the meetings of the navigators and adventurers, and of all classes, the voyages in the Atlantic and along the African coast constituted the whole exciting topic of conversation and discussion. Expeditions returning from successful discoveries, or departing on voyages of brilliant expectations, aroused each time the public excitement to the greatest point. The discovery of the Madeira and Azores Islands seemed to have given rise to the most extravagant tales of vast islands lying farther out at sea and not yet discovered, though dimly seen or ineffectually approached in the imagination

of ever hopeful and excitable sailors. The constant reports of the discovery of new kingdoms on the African coast, and of new islands in the Atlantic on the African route to Asia, fired the imaginations; stimulated the adventures, nerved the energies, and inflamed the fancies of the varied, commingling, diversified and scientific groups of aspiring people attracted together from every quarter of Europe at Lisbon. Commotion and excitement constituted the staple resources of this strange city. Delusions, seeking mythical islands, cities and empires, and the imaginations of overwrought adventurers, filled the Atlantic with phantom islands and lands. The Egyptian narrative of once powerful and vast Atlantis, now submerged by direst cataclysm, was revived. Aristotle's Antilla was again called up from the abyss to the possible horizon of the ocean. The tradition of the *Island of the Seven Cities*, over each of which presided a bishop, and where many an adventurous Portuguese pilot was alleged to have visited and was detained for fear that he might communicate to Spain the existence of the island, was now again repeated with every assurance of its verity. The famous Island of St. Brandan came forth to view, and its mountains and forests had been often and distinctly seen by the inhabitants of the Canaries, and so vividly presented to Prince Henry the Navigator, that several expeditions were sent out to discover and locate it, and the failure of each did not deter others from following the same delusive method; a method not based upon scientific data as were the subsequent triumphant voyages of Christopher Columbus. But in the Portuguese rage for maritime expeditions and new territorial discoveries there was much that was practical blended with the chimerical, much that resulted in extending the known area of the earth, and increasing the domains of that kingdom. The glorious career of Prince Henry, the Navigator in seeking Asia by the southern route around Africa had a brilliant and successful result after the Prince's death, and after Columbus had discovered the New World in seeking Asia. For it was the Portuguese who finally succeeded by that route in reaching Asia. The atmosphere of naval and maritime energy and prowess, which Columbus breathed during his residence at Lisbon, had a vast influence on his intelligent and enthusiastic character and mind, and constituted a part of the schooling, which he received for his illustrious and providential work.

But another powerful element entered here; one which greatly harmonized with the devout character and apostolic mission of Columbus. While the rage for Atlantic adventure and discovery aroused other nations to exertion in the same direction, the Holy See was the most profound, earnest and beneficent participator in these significant movements, to which, however, by its divine and apos-

tolic commission, religion gave a higher and holier purpose and aim. With the two-fold object of promoting the extension of human knowledge of the earth and encouraging science, and still more of opening new fields for the spread of the Gospel, it bestowed every blessing and privilege upon them. In order to confirm the splendid work of Prince Henry and of the Crown of Portugal, the Holy See conferred upon Portugal the primatial right over all the barbarous countries the Portuguese might discover, from Cape Bojador to the *East Indies*. The Holy Father also threatened with spiritual deprivations and penalties all who should thwart these beneficent strides of a Christian nation into the realms of paganism, and a plenary indulgence was granted to all such as might join these now blessed expeditions and perish in promoting them in the manner pointed out by the papal conditions. These generous concessions imparted to these maritime expeditions, virtually, the character of a crusade, and the crown of martyrdom was offered to the self-sacrificed. Neither the aspirations of his boyhood, when looking longingly to the sea from his native Genoese hills, nor the scientific problems evolving in his ever-active mind, nor the robust naval campaigns of over twenty years, nor the conversations of veteran navigators, nor his own struggles to rise from poverty, nor his ambition, nor the correspondence of the learned, so impressed the devout and profound mind and soul of Columbus, all combined, as did the single blessing of the Church.

But there was another school, in which the preparation of Columbus for his sacred mission must have received immense development at this time. His wife's father was Bartholomew Moñis de Perestrella, an Italian gentleman naturalized in Portugal, a protégé of Prince Henry the Navigator, the discoverer and colonizer of the island of Porto Santo. The vastness of his landed estates on this island, the reluctance of the Portuguese for colonization, the sterility of the land, and the annihilating ravages of the swarms of rabbits, had ruined his fortunes, and though he left his family poor, there was to Columbus, besides the attractions of the young, beautiful, and pious wife, whose Italian descent also drew him again more closely to his native country, a mine of wealth and information in the maritime traditions of such a family, in the maps and charts which the deceased navigator had left behind him and which Columbus' mother-in law took special pleasure in laying before his eager eyes, in the conversations with her, in which she repeated the animating stories her husband had related so often of the sea and of his voyages, and in the companionship of voyagers, navigators, seamen, and captains, who habitually resorted to the home of the family, and perpetuated by their sailor's yarns, and the stories and experiences of many an adventurous voyage,

the history of the past, while they contributed much to the making of future history. So much was this the case that it gave origin after the admiral's death, and as late as 1603, a century and a half after the discovery, to one of the most unjust assaults upon his well-earned fame, a libel upon his life and history, a malignant calumny upon his name and reputation. This unworthy invention is to the effect that while Columbus was living at Terceira, one of the Azores, with his wife, mother, and little son, Diego Columbus, who had been born to him at Porto Santo, he received with hospitality into his humble home five shipwrecked mariners, driven by western Atlantic storms upon that island, these five being the remnants of a crew of seventeen; the rest were lost at sea. That of these five seamen, four died in the house of Columbus, one after another, from the injuries of their shipwreck, that the last survivor was named Alonzo Sanchez, of Huelva in Spain, and that after imparting to Columbus his invaluable secret, he too expired in the arms of the future admiral. The pretended secret of the shipwrecked sailors was that they had sailed from the Canaries for Madeira, and were overtaken by furious storms and forced across the Atlantic to an unknown land, whose latitude they took and whose description they committed to writing, and that on their return they were again overwhelmed with storms, lost all of their number except five, and these were tossed, scarcely alive on the shores of Terceira, that the expiring Sanchez imparted the secret to Columbus, and that the land they thus discovered was the same that was afterwards called Hispaniola by Columbus. It was a part of the libel that Columbus kept this secret and used it as his guide in discovering America. This calumny was so utterly without foundation, so diametrically contradicted by known and undisputed facts, so entirely at variance with the independent, upright, truthful, frank, and honorable character of Columbus, and has been so triumphantly refuted by arguments drawn from history, reason, and authority, that now no one is so reckless as to repeat it. It has served, however, the only purpose of showing how, not only his public associations, but also his private relations, concurred in pointing to Columbus as the discoverer of the New World and in preparing him for the work.

Columbus was thirty-three years old when he was transferred from active, robust, and stirring service on the sea, the school in which he learned so completely the sciences of practical seamanship and navigation, to the more scientific, comprehensive, and cosmographical theatre of geographical adventure and discovery, of national and economic colonization, of statesmanlike expansion, of political progress, and of national aggrandizement. To him it was a school of personal culture, of profound scientific investiga-

tion, of domestic virtues and affections thus developed, from those of a model son to those even more tender ones of husband and father; it was a school of the novitiate for the apostolic vocation of the lay missionary, of the most chivalrous loyalty to the Holy See and the Church, and above all to religion, of Christian self-denial, the correction of a naturally angry disposition and the acquisition of personal and graceful virtues, of the most profound and ascetic type outside of the cloister; a school of divine and earthly wisdom, in which he acquired that ability for affairs the most intricate and difficult, which Washington Irving and historians generally recognize as enabling him afterwards in the drama of discovered worlds to bear himself with consummate action. It was a school in which he studied alike the applied sciences, the geography of the known earth, and penetrated with majestic genius the yet unknown. Here he studied the Sacred Scriptures, and pondered over the prophecies; and here the fathers of the Church, the doctors of the schools, the mystic theology of the Middle Ages, the history of the crusades, the splendid career of the Church, the works of Christian civilization, became familiar to his studious and gifted mind. He assimilated them all, morally and intellectually. He spent seven years at Lisbon, apparently fruitless years so far as active and historic results reveal themselves, but they were the years of his august preparation; years during which his great problem developed to perfection. Tarducci says that "Christopher Columbus was one of the best geographers and cosmographers of the age, and was accustomed to the sea from his infancy; and coming at this time to Portugal he found himself in his natural element, and his delight is easily imagined." Count Roselly de Lorgues speaks of his arrival in Lisbon as miraculous; of the development of his genius; the expansion of his comparative faculties; his holding constant communication with the learned and the great of earth; the completion of his physical vigor and intellectual endowments, the noble largeness of his forehead, now fully developed, indicated thought. It is here his history commences; he associated with kings by the sheer force of his learning and genius, and the potentiality of his vast services to the State. Even his home at Porto Santo during a part of those seven years was a school to the studious discoverer, for here he examined the whole of the progress of the Portuguese discoverers along the coast of Guinea, and the route they followed. "Here," says the Count de Lorgues, "surrounded by the immensity of the ocean—an image of the Infinite—under the dazzling light of a tropical sun, the genius of Columbus matured in the depths of his thoughts a superhuman idea—a project bolder than that of any known heroism. What he had seen, what he had heard, served only to corrobo-

rate the justice of his inductions. His habits, his tastes, his family connections seemed to be prearranged for the furtherance of the plan, which was elaborated in the depths of his reflections."

In an age of maritime excitement and self-delusion, the genius of Columbus, acting upon scientific data, distinguished the illusive from the real, rejected the phantom islands and lands of heated imaginations, and stood steadily to the true scientific theory, which he alone among men had discovered and was ready to apply. Mr. Irving says: "The construction of a correct map or chart in those days, required a degree of knowledge and experience sufficient to entitle the possessor to distinction," and speaks of the knowledge, skill, and superior correctness of Columbus as a cosmographer, as winning "for him notoriety among men of science." "His geographical labors elevated him to a communion with the learned." "He was led to know how much of the world remained unknown, and to meditate on the means of exploring it." "The enthusiastic nature of his conceptions gave an elevation to his spirit and a dignity and loftiness to his whole demeanor." . . . "His views were princely and unbounded." Such are the sentiments of Washington Irving on the genius and character of Columbus.

Many more historians could be quoted who have paid exalted tributes to the character of Columbus, had we time to quote from them. Time and space will permit but one additional quotation. The English Jesuit, Father Arthur George Knight, thus speaks of him: "Columbus was certainly a man of prompt action and ready wit, keenly conscious of all that was passing around him, self-possessed in danger and fertile in resources; but he was not the less on that account a great reader, a great student, and a dreamer of splendid dreams. He was acquainted with all the cosmographical learning of the time, and well versed in all the books which were then regarded as oracular in their assertions about the confines of the habitable globe. He had pored over the glowing pages of Marco Polo till the magnificent vision of Cipango and Cathay (founded upon the actual wonders of China and Japan) had fastened upon his soul, and he never doubted that the Grand Khan was such as he had been depicted, and only waited the summons of the Catholic sovereigns, to be baptized with all his people." "Few men indeed, perhaps only Saints, have escaped like Columbus with unwounded conscience from such turbulent scenes." "He had strongly grasped the fundamental truth that the actions of men have their meaning and value from reference to the life of God Incarnate." "The grand idea which filled the mind and claimed the whole soul of Columbus was to make a highway round the earth, and bring the nations in willing homage to the

feet of Jesus Christ, reigning once more in Jerusalem of the Christians."

Little now is needed to complete the delineation of the man, who, feeling his providential mission revealed within him, resolutely bent all his energies for many years to a thorough preparation for his great mission. A few more words will suffice. The rich graces which abounded in his soul from the inexhaustible religious fountains to which he constantly resorted, embraced among them a pious humility which was not ostentatiously practiced, but gently found expression in an innate self-control and outward modesty of appearance, dress, manners and habits. It was this that added such rare grace to his majestic stature and carriage, and elegantly harmonized with his dignified and manly character. So intense had been his studies of all the sciences connected with the great problem he was to solve, and such his checkered life, that his hair, which was naturally blonde inclining to chestnut, was turning gray at the age of thirty-three. His gestures were natural, easy, graceful and impressive, and he was an orator, when need be, of no mediocre power and eloquence. His intellect seemed to rejoice in the strength, proportions and perfections of his perfect physique. His senses were acute to a fine degree; he possessed a rare fineness of hearing, cultured by his constant out-door life and the habit and the necessity of meeting dangers of every kind. His keenness of sight served him in many a dire crisis, and enabled him to discern the most minute differences of colors and classify the finest tints, and to measure distances when he was in search of worlds. His delicacy of taste was equally remarkable, and by it he could trace differences and detect qualities inappreciable to men generally. His delicacy of smell surpassed all these, and with his perfection of other senses enabled him to value and admire more than other men the beautiful works of the Creator, so that he found in the book of nature endless sources of infinite delight and profound study; his knowledge and appreciation of the habits and qualities of flowers, birds, sea products, spices, perfumes, waters, waves, general vegetation, winds, clouds, fishes, and in fact of every object in nature, were manifested constantly, and especially during his first and succeeding voyages to the New World. His sense of touch was like an armor to one who, *levant and couchant*, was exposed to so many dangers. While his clothing was rigidly plain, it was exquisitely clean and white, neat and appropriate. His horsemanship was perfect. He was a valiant knight—a veritable Bayard, without fear or reproach; a crusader; a soldier on land, a mariner on the water—at once a general and an admiral.

Columbus was free from vices of every kind, and his long

contact with rude and vicious people on the seas had never impaired his morals; swearing and profane songs sickened him; he abstained from wine and the delicacies of the table, refrained from games of chance and all effeminate luxuries, restricting himself almost to a vegetable diet. His habits of order and punctuality were exact, and he seemed always to strive to accomplish the best and most perfect thing of which the situation was capable. He was affectionate and tender to his relatives and friends, kind and gentle to inferiors, and to his enemies and criminals he was forbearing and forgiving. To his parents he was the most loyal of sons. He was munificent, and his liberality was co-extensive with the vast realms he discovered, and excelled even the vice-regal revenues to which he was at once entitled, and of which he was unjustly deprived. He was public-spirited, enterprising and unconventional, fruitful in resources and ever prepared for emergencies. He was eloquent, graceful, graphic, yet natural. He was imaginative and poetic, giving vent, in his later years, to his feelings in verse, and his thoughts expressed assumed an epic and massive grandeur. Whether on land or sea, he was devout, religious, chaste, and regular in his devotions and pious practices. No surroundings, however degraded or vicious, could impair his character. His worship of the Creator in his works, whether on land or sea, was like a perpetual renewal of that sublime anthem, *A solis ortu usque ad occasum, laudabile nomen Domini!* His natural and acquired gifts, whether of body, or mind, or heart or soul, would have pointed him out under more favorable circumstances as the future discoverer of the New World. As it was, he could not pass without notice, though observers never penetrated the cause. These gifts, viewed with his assured and oft asserted claim to a divine mission, toward the accomplishment of which his every aspiration tended until his final accomplishment of the greatest of human deeds, show that with him preparation was equal to destiny, readiness was equal to promise, and finally, accomplishment was equal to prophesy.

The subject of Christopher Columbus will be continued in the issues of April, July and October, with the second, third and fourth progressive articles: Second, for April, The Prophesy—The Offer—The Acceptance. Third, for July, The Accomplishment. Fourth, for October, Ingratitude, Misfortunes, Posthumous Honors. The series will contain every leading fact of his history, will interpret his remarkable and profound character, vindicate his memory from unjust calumnies, maintain his proper place in the annals of our race, and present him to the cordial, generous and patriotic admiration, gratitude and honor of our country.

RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

I.—AN OBJECTION AGAINST THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPE.

SOME time ago the *Catholic World* published an important article on the "temporal sovereignty of the Pope," from the pen of one, to whom we can apply a well known phrase: "*cuius laus est in universa Americæ ecclesia.*"¹ A distinguished Catholic priest in his remarks on this article, incidentally called attention to an objection "which rises naturally in the minds of republican Catholics." He formulates this objection in the following words:

"There is no use trying to enlighten the Catholic laity, unless you place in the clearest light the consistency between the right of the Pope to independence and the right of the people to self-government. That the Pope ought to be free to treat with all the nations of the earth, of course, all admit, but how his temporal sovereignty consists with republican principles is the question to be treated in an article addressed to the people of these United States; and Catholic writers should devote their energies to making clear this aspect of the great and important subject. We Catholics live in the midst of fifty-five millions of people estranged from the Church, and holding theoretically, at least, this latter principle; we cleave to it ourselves as well; in order, therefore, that we may give to the Pope 'reasonable service' in this matter, and give also to our fellow citizens 'a reason for the faith that is in us,' and answer their demand—'why we meddle with the affairs of Italy?'—we must have more on the subject."

We entirely agree with this conclusion and express our conviction in the following words: We are sincere Catholics and sincere patriots. A theoretical or practical consequence of Catholic doctrine can never conflict with true patriotism. Contradictions can therefore only be apparent; they are either inexact and grounded on a defective knowledge of Catholic teaching, or not to the point.

The appropriateness of treating the question is therefore manifest.² Another consideration will prove its opportuneness and necessity.

The Pope, according to Catholic doctrine, is not only the infal-

¹ Very Reverend A. J. Hewit, *Catholic World*, December, 1890.

² We may be allowed to mention that, before the above lines came to our notice, we referred to the difficulty and answered it substantially, in an article in which we openly defended the application of the principles of self-government to France. See AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1891, "Cardinal Lavigerie and the French Republic," p. 120, note.

lible teacher, but also the supreme ruler of the Church. A Catholic owes *assensum fidei* to his doctrinal definitions, and *plenam obedientiam* to his orders and precepts. Complete obedience in both cases is the characteristic of a true Catholic.

“Summus autem est magister in Ecclesia Pontifex Romanus. Concordia igitur animorum sicut perfectum in una fide consensum requirit, ita voluntates postulat Ecclesiae Romanoque Pontifici perfecte subiectas atque obtemperantes, ut Deo. *Perfecta* autem esse obedientia debet, quia ab ipsa fide praecipitur, et habet hoc commune cum fide, ut *dividua* esse non possit . . . cuiusmodi perfectioni tantum christiana consuetudo tribuit, ut illa *tanquam nota internoscendi catholicos* et habita semper sit et habeatur.”—Encyclica “Sapientiae Christianae,” 1889.

The following facts are undeniable : First, the Pope himself does not cease advocating his claims to the Temporal Power. In the Encyclical “Inscrutabili,” 21st April, 1878, he says : “Never shall we abstain from claiming that freedom be again restored to the Holy See by the recovery of the temporal power.” Therefore, we renew all the declarations and protestations of our predecessor, Pius IX., of blessed memory. Again, “It is our sacred duty,” the holy Father says in an allocution to the College of Cardinals, March 2, 1880, “to preserve our right intact in spite of all opposition to the contrary, no matter whence it comes.” This alone is enough to convince a Catholic that the “*concordia animorum*” forbids silence on this question ; more especially at this time when our Father in his distress and afflictions appeals to the hearts of his children for sympathy and redress.

Secondly, the Holy Father expressly calls upon the Catholics of the whole world to second his efforts in the defence of his rights and the restoration of his territorial independence, and thus prove themselves devoted and loyal Catholics. “The Catholics of the various States can never hold their peace until they see their Chief, the teacher of their faith, the guide of their consciences, again possessed of true liberty and really independent.” (Letter to the Secretary of State, Cardinal Nina, August 27, 1878.) Therefore the Holy Father doubts not “but that all Catholics all the world over will support, openly and unrestrained, these rights of the Holy See” (Allocution, June 1, 1888.) Frequently he directs this admonition to the Catholics of Italy itself (3d January, 1888.) With an affectionate tenderness he reminds Catholic writers and above all Catholic journalists of this duty : “Therefore, my beloved sons, cease not, both by word of mouth and in your writings, to contend that the temporal sovereignty of the Pope is necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual power.” (Address to Catholic journalists, February 22, 1879.)

II.—THE TRUE QUESTION.

We treat this question from the Catholic standpoint, as it is derived from that twofold obedience which characterizes a Catholic. Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens must likewise accept the same standpoint as the basis of their criticism. We need not prove *to a Catholic* that the Pope, by Divine disposition, has the right and the duty to rule the Church in perfect immunity and independence of any earthly power, and that, by the same Divine right, he is exempt from any secular jurisdiction whatsoever. He therefore is—as Leo XIII. expresses it—"by the express will of the Founder of the Church not subject to any secular power." (Letter to Cardinal Rampolla, 15th June, 1887.)

The *right* to this immunity is essential to the Papacy. The *exercise* of that right however, is not absolutely necessary to the existence of the Church (*ut Ecclesia sit*), but it is necessary for the perfect development of its social life (*ut bene sit*). Providence availed itself of the *Temporal Power* as a *means* to secure to the Popes the free and undisturbed development of their sublime prerogative.

In the early ages, triumphant and victorious, all through the many and bitter persecutions, the Church had the stamp of her Divine origin set upon her. Those years might be called the Church's infancy. The time came, however, when she was to put forth the full vigor of life. The freedom and independence of the Head of the Church was, by Divine Providence, to foster its steady growth, and thus it came to pass that the Popes acquired the temporal dominion over Rome, the seat of their Pontificate. (See letter to Cardinal Rampolla.) No unbiased, unprejudiced historian has ever called into question the *legitimacy* of this temporal dominion and that, too, considering only its historical origin. This, for us, is a settled question in our present discussion. Likewise, we need not prove that the Pope after the spoliation of his States, *i.e.*, since September 20, 1870, no longer enjoys that liberty and independence which the nature and dignity of his office demand. "*Verius in aliena potestate sumus quam nostra*," "We are more really in the power of another than our own." We might refer to two facts which will convince even the most ardent friend of Italian unity of the truth of these words of Leo XIII. The outrageous scandals of which Rome was the scene in the early part of October, 1891, when the city echoed the cry "*abasso il Papa*"; the infamous insult which was heaped upon the corpse of the great Pius amid the demon cries, "*al fiume*." These two events in the history of New Italy speak more than volumes.

In fine a Catholic cannot rejoin: "Let the Pope look for a free

abode elsewhere," for his faith tells him that to this day it is *only* as *Bishop of Rome* that the Popes succeed St. Peter and possess the plenitude of apostolic power. We may add that it is a theological truth drawn from the teaching of faith that the Primacy *iure divino* belongs, until the end of time, to the Bishop of Rome *alone*, and that it therefore cannot be transferred even by the Pope himself to another See. But suppose this last were possible, still we cannot find therein a solution of the difficulty; for elsewhere the same questions may arise. It therefore remains true that the Pope as Bishop of Rome, and according to the natural order of things—in Rome and from Rome—governs and directs the affairs of the Church of God unmolested, and that in Rome at least he must not be subject to any secular authority, that is, the Pope must also be the temporal ruler of Rome. In this sense Catholics in concert with the Pope declare the necessity of the Temporal Power. Catholics need not be told that this necessity cannot be made the subject of a *dogma*, since it is not a matter of revealed truth. Neither do we discuss the question whether it is a dogmatic fact and whether consequently, the supreme ecclesiastical authority *can* by an infallible definition make it *de fide ecclesiastica*. Nor do we inquire whether Pius IX. or Leo XIII. really did *define* the necessity of the Temporal Power. We are satisfied that all dutiful children of the Church, in obedience to the Holy Father ought faithfully to maintain the necessity of the Temporal Power—" *firmissime retinere*," as the Syllabus expresses it.¹ We are only concerned with the task of reconciling this duty of Catholics with certain principles of modern and particularly of American public right.

We divide the objection into two parts according to the two principles upon which it rests: *The people are sovereign*; and *salus publica suprema lex*: private interest must be subordinated to the public good!

We must first agree on the terms we shall use. The harmony between the right of the Pope to independence and the right of the people to self-government, does not mean that the Pope has a right to be the temporal ruler of Rome independently of the consent of the Roman people, and that at the same time the Roman people has actually a right to choose its own ruler!

Nor will we prove that the temporal power is in harmony with republican principles in this sense, that the Pope's right to monarchical government does not exclude the right of the Roman people to proclaim the republic!

¹ "Praeter hos errores explicite notatos alii complures implicite reprobantur proposita et asserta doctrina, quam catholici omnes firmissime retinere debent, de civili Romani Pontificis principatu."—See *Syllab.*, 76.

We will not strive to reconcile contradictions. The school of Fichte itself would find it difficult to do so; and surely no American principle demands it.

If two rights are contradictory, then one of them is no right, or, at least, one of them ceases to be a right, because of this contradiction.

Our task is to prove that we give "reasonable service" to our Church and to our country.

"Giving a reason" for our liberty of thought and conscience guaranteed by our Constitution, we shall prove that as philosophers we admit, *in abstracto*, not only "republican principle," but also in a true sense a "sovereignty of the people."

"Giving a reason" for our patriotism, we have only to prove that the Catholic view of the Roman question does not hinder us from being wholly and sincerely attached to our Constitution and from obeying the laws of our country. Freely "giving a reason for the faith that is in us," we shall prove that neither "republican principle" nor the "right of the people to self-government" have anything to do with the "right of the Pope to independence"; in a word, that this right does not fall under any such "principle."

The following words of Brownson are to the point: "Liberty is never to be understood as exemption from all restraints, nor from all restraints but those which are *self-imposed*, which are no restraints at all . . . there is a strong tendency, and, I hold, a dangerous tendency, among us . . . to extol and defer to the alleged wisdom and good sense of the mass. . . . The genuine people, if their voice could really be heard, would be loud and earnest in condemnation of this tendency. . . . In the name of science, of knowledge, of wisdom, of virtue, of the people, . . . I for one solemnly protest against this servility to the mass, a servility to which a man never submits in good faith nor for honest purposes. . . . Let us, then, cease our adulation of the mass, cease our insane efforts to adapt everything to the apprehension of the mass, to gauge the amount of truth we may tell by the amount the multitude can take in; and do our best to gain all truth, to nourish and invigorate ourselves for wisely-directed and long-continued efforts for the elevation of all men."¹

¹ Works of O. Brownson, vol. xv., p. 299, *segg.* A careful study of the articles, "Origin and Ground of Government," "Demagogueism," "National Greatness," would answer the objection we are considering.

We use the words "self-government" and "sovereignty of the people," although they cannot be strictly taken in their literal meaning. Their true sense will be made clear as we proceed. Let us also note that "republican principle" and the "right of self-government" are very different things; the one does not imply the other.

III.—INDIRECT ANSWER.

We will add one remark which contains an answer to the difficulty, though it does not give a real *solution*. No Catholic has a right to make his obedience to the Pope subservient to his own scientific views, political theories, or local national desires. His obedience should be "perfect," "undivided," "absolute," not a "*simulacrum obedientiæ*" which destroys the "*natura obedientiæ*," as Leo XIII. remarks in the same encyclical. In our religious duties we are not to look up to Nationalism as our guide but to the Church. As a matter of fact we know full well that the faithful performance of our duties as citizens of the United States does not bring us into conflict with any doctrinal or moral teaching of the Catholic religion. As Catholics, and precisely because we are Catholics, we should not allow any one to surpass us in that respect. But the objection supposes the opposite. This will explain our categorical answer.

If every nation of the world asserted its national standpoint as a *conditio sine qua non* of its obedience to the Pope, what would be the result? Have they not all the same right to hold dear their national traditions, customs and regulations as we Americans? The Church, like a loving and just mother, always respects national peculiarities and all just claims founded on them. In this, the Church gives us an example worthy of imitation. But just as she unites all in the unity of faith, she also desires all to be one in obedience to her visible head. *Ecclesia nationum, non vero nationalis!* this is the apostolic motto of the Catholic Church; this is one of the notes characterizing her as the one true Church.

IV.—DIRECT ANSWER.

A—*The Sovereignty of the People.*

Now let us attempt a complete solution. Our opponents say: "We have positive reasons to reserve our judgment on the Roman question. For, as Americans, we recognize the principle of popular sovereignty; it is the ground-work of the Constitution of the United States, the support of our public and political life. But now, did not the Italian, or at least the Roman people desire the fall of the temporal power of the Pope? Is it not a contradiction, then, for us to extol the sovereign will of the people of this country and at the same time to approve of the restoration of the territorial independence of the Pope? Is that not virtually to deny the sovereignty of another people?"

We ask, has popular sovereignty any place *in the Church*? The answer of Catholic doctrine is *No*. To enter deeply into a confirmation of this answer here would be out of place, but a concise

explanation is necessary to illustrate the religious aspect of our question.

The Church is an institution essentially supernatural, to which all men, by the decree of God, must look for salvation. The Incarnate Son of God founded it immediately and in His own person, and gave it that authority which was to bring about that happy and blessed union here below, whose highest ideal and antetype is in heaven, "that they all may be one as Thou, Father, in me and I in Thee." But more than this, the Divine Founder of the Church not only defined the spiritual power His Church was to exercise for that end, but he also designated in particular *who* were to exercise it. Upon St. Peter and his successors He bestowed the plenitude of pastoral power; to the successors of the other Apostles, the bishops, He entrusted the direction of particular churches "in which the Holy Ghost had placed them." Every Pope receives immediately from Christ the entire Apostolic authority with which Peter, the first Pope, was endowed. This authority is, therefore, neither in its origin nor in its exercise, dependent on the approbation of the Church, the bishops, the priests, or the laity. The Episcopacy, no less than the Papacy, is of divine institution; it is an essential institution of the Church. Nevertheless it remains true, that only *One* rules the *whole* Church, that only *One* possesses the fulness of power; that all others are subject to Him; that He can judge all, but cannot be judged by any one; that He is the centre of unity about which all must gather to be partakers of the Kingdom of God.

The constitution of the Church is, therefore, truly monarchical, though tempered to a certain extent with the aristocracy of the divinely instituted Episcopacy, but not mixed with it. The rest of the faithful are the *ecclesia discens*. The authority of the Church does not proceed from them, nor does it depend on them, either immediately or mediately. Still, all the offices of the Church, the highest included, are within the reach of the humblest of its members. In this sense, and only in this sense, can we speak of a democratic element in the constitution of the Church.

Efforts to introduce the principle of popular sovereignty into the Church have not been wanting. The court theologian of Louis, the Bavarian, Marsilius Patavinus, inaugurated the movement in the thirteenth century. He claimed that, according to the will of Christ, all ecclesiastical power is vested in the people. Gerson and Peter D'Ailly enunciated similar principles during the Great Schism of the West. The apostate, de Dominis, sought to spread them in the seventeenth century. From his works, the Gallicans, especially Richter, drew their arguments; Jansenism, Febronianism, Josephism, had recourse to the same theological arsenal for their weapons.

At the time of the Vatican Council, Döllinger renewed this theory, inasmuch as he claimed that the bishops at the Council are only mandatories of the people. The clear decisions of this Council dealt the death-blow to all these attempts. If, in spite of this, Catholics dare to assert, or write, that "the Church desires a non-Italian Pope, *who will grant the people a greater share in the government of the Church,*" we can only say, that such an assertion is the untheological offspring of a narrow-minded nationalism.

Protestantism, to be consistent with its denial of the ecclesiastical principle of authority, was forced to place all ecclesiastical power in the hands of the people. It rejected the divine origin of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and transferred all power to the various "congregations" (*gemeinde*), and degraded the "ministers of the word" to mere representatives of the people. Secular princes, whose aid could not be dispensed with, were made the highest representatives of the community. This was practically to convert the sovereignty of the people with regard to ecclesiastical matters into *Cæsaro-papism*.

II.—POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AS A POLITICAL PRINCIPLE.

We have now to consider the sovereignty of the people from a political, and especially from an American standpoint. *Is it a general principle? Is it an American principle? And in what sense?*

Popular sovereignty can be understood to mean that the *ultimate reason* and *original source* of all authority is the common consent of all—the will of the people, and not God, of whom all paternity, all authority, is called in heaven and on earth. This principle is totally false; or rather, no principle at all. Precisely in this sense did Hobbes and Rousseau, the founders of this modern theory, put forth their doctrine; each one adding a shade of coloring of his own. Their set purpose, in asserting the sovereignty of the people, was to separate and estrange society from any and every relation to a personal God—to establish the "State without God." Though it does not always openly avow it, Liberalism employs this principle in the sense of the "*contrat social*," and this for a like purpose. Popular sovereignty renders it an immense service; for it is a fruitful source whence are derived the means of furthering its plans, and legalizing State-absolutism. We are not to regard the sovereign power of the people in this atheistic-materialistic sense.

Anarchists and Socialists openly declare that the sovereignty of the people is to be understood in that sense, and that they intend to carry out their plans on that principle as soon as they have a majority in the Houses of Legislation. '

The cynical saying of Bebel, "*Ja gäbe es einen Gott, dann wären*

wir geleiht"—"If there were a God, we would be caught in a trap"—leaves no room for conjecture on that head.

In Rousseau's system, accordingly, the source of all right is the people, *i.e.*, the majority of those who call themselves the people's representatives, or the "State," the government of which is determined by the "people." In their political enactments, this sovereign people recognize no divine or natural law—no inborn or acquired right. Whatever is legal is, according to this theory, allowable and good. Every change of government, every revolution, is, *ipso facto*, justifiable as soon as it is accomplished by the people, or in the name of the people. *Quod populo placuit legis habet vigorem*—"The will of the people has the force of law" in any and under all circumstances. Shall we, can we, as Christians, and as citizens, defend our position on any political question with this notion of popular sovereignty? No; never. That would mean, in other words: To be a good American citizen, one must tread under foot, at least theoretically, the rights of God and man; or, the American citizen, as such, is a revolutionist against any and every authority above his own! In the name of all that we hold sacred in our religion, in the name of our patriotism, we decline to defend our position on the Roman question, or on any other political or politico-religious question, against the representatives of that "principle," whether they call themselves Socialists or not. We can come to no understanding with materialism, or make any concessions to it. We are a Christian people. We despise a Robespierre who, in the name of the people, wished to do away with the existence of God by an enactment of the State; we have just as little in common with modern political deists, who are striving to place Almighty God on the retired list with a pension.

On political events, then, such as the overthrow of an existing government, we pass judgment according to the divine and natural law; according to the eternal principles of justice which worldly power may thrust aside and despise; but which it can never subvert or destroy. Our question can, therefore, only be the following:

Is it not a principle of natural right, that God, the fountain-head of all authority, has placed political authority in the hands of the people, from whom all government, whether monarchical or democratic, directly derives its authority?

You have full right to hold this doctrine, and we do not oppose it ourselves. Most of the Christian philosophers and theologians were formerly, and still are, of the opinion that the *consensus populi* is the proximate cause of civil society, and that the civil power, considered in particular persons, comes only mediately from God, but immediately from the people. But it cannot be put

down as an unquestionable philosophical principle of the natural law. It is, at most, but an opinion, even though it be a very probable one. There are many acknowledged authorities who do not even recognize the sovereignty of the people to be a principle in that sense, but defend the opinion that the will of the people only designates the bearer of public authority, while God himself confers on him immediately the power to rule. It would be preposterous to deny this fact, and not at all courteous to assert that the defenders of this last opinion have no good reason for it, and that the opposite must be perfectly obvious, must be, *prima facie*, evident to all.¹ Moreover, it is well to remark that those who hold to the more democratic opinion do not allow the people the right to overthrow and rid themselves of a lawfully constituted government which has lost favor in its eyes upon the plea of popular sovereignty. This would be to sanction revolution indiscriminately, as Rousseau has done. They likewise admit that there may be *other legitimate titles* to the exercise of supreme civil authority, as there have been at all times and are to this day.

As Catholics, we are entirely free to embrace either one of these two opinions. The Church has defined nothing in this matter. She has been content, at all times, to confront revolutionary machinations with the Apostolic doctrine (on that account none the less evident to reason), that God, the author of nature, created man a social being, and therefore willed that authority, without which a well-ordered society of free agents cannot be conceived. Therefore, all civil authority is mediately from God. In very truth, then, do the bearers of it reign "by the Grace of God."

Now suppose a people determines to adopt a constitution, then most assuredly, it can without any detriment to the natural law, choose a democratic as well as a monarchical form of government. It can positively declare, through its representatives, that in the government about to be established the supreme authority, divinely ordained, actually proceeds from the people; and that their representatives are only to exercise it as their delegates. In such a State or society the theory of popular sovereignty has the effect of a fundamental law, by which every loyal citizen must abide; which he is to look to for the preservation of his civil and political rights, and which accordingly must guide him in the performance

¹ See the authors for both opinions in the works of Costa-Rossetti, S. J., who strenuously defends the first opinion: *Philosophia Moralis*, p. 593, *seq.*; *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 1888-90; *Die Staatslehre der Christlichen Philosophie*. S. Thomas treats this question, q. 2, 9, 10, a. 10; q. 12, a. 2; I, 2, q. 105, a. 1; q. 90, a. 3; q. 92, a. 3; ad. 3. One of the most ardent and profound advocates of the rights of the people is Suarez, *Defensio fidei*, l. 3, c. 2; *De legibus*, l. 3, c. 4. See also Brownson's *Origin and Ground of Government*.

of his duties. Thereupon the representatives of the people may declare: "We accept the democratic theory as the principle of the government under which we are going to live." A Parliament with a thousand members could not do more than this. It is beyond its competency to change a question of natural and public right into a general principle which shall be universally binding. And, if in our day the theory of popular sovereignty has been recognized in most States, and has passed into current public right, it is significant of nothing but that modern governments have accepted it as the ground-work of their constitution. This is precisely the case in our glorious Republic. With us the sovereignty of the people is at the bottom of all public right. Indeed, nowhere do we see it exercised so liberally. But the framers of our Constitution, who were by no means hostile to the interests of religion, did not dream of approving the theory of popular sovereignty in the atheistical sense of a Rousseau. Just as little did they wish to decide the abstract question about the origin of civil authority. Considering the peculiar condition in which our people lived, they simply looked upon a Constitution founded on the sovereign will of the people as the best for our country.

From what has been said we draw a two-fold conclusion: In the first place, that we as citizens of the United States, have an indisputable right to hold popular sovereignty in the highest esteem; to proclaim aloud that it is the best system of government for the American people, because it accords best with our character and the traditions of our country. But, it would be most ridiculous, and this is the other conclusion, were we to maintain that we had thereby established a principle which should be binding for all times and be accepted by all nations. With precisely the same right, may another system be adopted elsewhere, which may equally well meet the desires, and may be practically as well adapted to the necessities of that country as our system is for us. Did we attempt to impose our political views on other peoples, whose character and wants may be totally unlike ours, we would be untrue to our American sense of liberty. No, a true American is proof against the madness of Chauvinism. God forbid that such a foreigner should ever be naturalized here.

Deductions.—What we have hitherto said, we think, warrants the following conclusions:

There is no sovereignty of the people, no self-government in the Catholic Church.

No Christian can defend the right of the people to self-government in the sense of Rousseau's theory.

Every Catholic may defend as true, the opinion that civil authority comes immediately from the people and mediately from God.

Every Catholic of the United States can, like any other citizen, acknowledge the right of self-government guaranteed by the Constitution, and his religious principles need not suffer in the least. He may also consider this system as the best one for this country. He may also advocate that it be introduced into all countries for which it is suitable. Finally, he, like every other citizen, has the obligation to render obedience to the government established according to the principles of the Constitution.

Now, it may be asked, does all this remain true, if we judge the Roman Question as the Pope does? if we not only desire the restoration of the Temporal Power, but also defend it?

Yes, even in this case, all this remains true! Nor do we contradict in any way our political views, or act contrary to our civil duties. If we Catholics acted otherwise *we would be illogical* and disloyal to our religious convictions.

Let us consider in the first place the *national standpoint*. As citizens of the United States we must unreservedly acknowledge the Constitution, in the above sense, and fulfill our duties accordingly. The obligation of a good citizen extends no further; it cannot extend further unless the liberty guaranteed by this very Constitution be only such in name. Or is it perhaps American to say: Every nation of the earth *must* be governed according to the same principles? This would be a ridiculous assumption. Is it necessary to pronounce the death sentence on all monarchies in order to be a true republican? This would be a contradiction of the very principle of self-government, which allows a people to transfer the supreme authority to any form of government, monarchical or democratic. Indeed, one can be a good citizen of any State, without maintaining its form of government to be absolutely or even relatively the best. If this were not so what would become of liberty of thought? of liberty of science and research? It would be downright tyranny if a government, if a people strove thus to fetter free thought.

Must a citizen of the United States approve of *every* revolution by which governments are overthrown? Such theories would declare revolutions the order of the day! Even the American people, notwithstanding its sovereignty, has no right violently to overthrow the Constitution; it has not even a right to forcibly oust the President or a majority in Congress before their term of office has expired. Thus, though every form of government be an immediately human institution, still from the very nature of the case it is a *permanent manner and means* of exercising authority, and the people must pay deference to it as such.¹

¹ "We utterly deny the right of revolution, or the right to resist, for any purpose whatever, legitimate government in the legal discharge of its functions. We repeat

Now what must our judgment be on the spoliation of the Papal States by Victor Emmanuel, considering it as a mere political event.

Let us first merely glance at the overthrow of the Pope's Temporal Power. The Italian or Roman people as such did not perpetrate that robbery. It was Freemasonry and the Piedmontese thirst for spoils which committed the outrage. The Roman plebiscitum of October 2, 1870, was a mere comedy and can in no way be said to have been the manifestations of the "sovereign will of the people," even if we allowed that the subjects of the Pope were sovereign. At present, however, we only wish to lay stress on the ground of principle. We therefore say: the Pope is as legitimately and rightfully the sovereign of the Papal States as any monarch or Executive Ruler, the whole world over. The legitimate form of government in his kingdom was always a purely monarchical one. Therefore the Temporal Power could not be set aside upon the plea of popular sovereignty—not by the Romans and much less by other Italians, except by the violation of justice and fidelity.

Some will say: We do not approve of the spoliation of the Papal States; but now we are face to face with the *fait accompli*, and behold it sanctioned by the Italian people. The explanation and application of the proposition "*Salus publica suprema lex*," will thoroughly answer this difficulty. (See B.)

Let us now give expression to our *Catholic conviction* on this question, by considering its *religious side*.

The Liberty—dearest of all which our Constitution permits us to enjoy, is liberty of conscience, religious freedom; the freedom to openly profess our faith and practice it by fulfilling the duties which it enjoins upon us.

As Catholics we believe that the successor of St. Peter is divinely appointed by God, to rule the entire Church, free and independent of any earthly power; and that all Catholics owe him unqualified obedience.

Furthermore we believe that the Bishop of Rome and only the Bishop of Rome, is the successor of St. Peter.

then, that the right of rebellion and revolution on the part of the people, is no right at all. The people can never have the right to act, save through the forms prescribed by the supreme authority." (Brownson, xv., p. 398). "The people of the United States and of the several states can amend the Constitution, but only constitutionally, through the government. The notion which has latterly gained some vogue, that there persists always a sovereign people back of the government or constitution or organic people, competent to alter, change, modify, or overturn the existing government at will, is purely revolutionary, fatal to all state government, to all political authority, to the peace and order of society, and to all security for liberty, either public or private."—(*id.* vol. xviii., p. 451).

Our faith then teaches us that the Bishop of Rome by Divine right must rule the Church freely and independently and that we owe him childlike submission.

It is therefore the will of God that the freedom of the Pope be *secure in Rome*, in order that he be truly independent in leading the whole flock of Christ.

This conclusion no Catholic can deny without a severe shock to the Dogma of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. The following conclusion is just as firm: Against the will of God there is no sovereignty upon earth, no sovereignty of the Cæsars, no sovereignty of one people or of all people taken together.

Hence, no Catholic can ever approve of any act or condition of things, by which the Pope is bereft of his full freedom and liberty.

"*Illa autem, quae sursum est Jerusalem, libera est quae est mater nostra!*" "Free she must be, that Jerusalem which is our Mother!" "*Itaque fratres, non sumus ancillae filii, sed liberae, qua libertate Christus nos liberavit!*" "We are not the children of a slave, but of a mother who is free-born." "We claim for her that freedom which Christ our Lord purchased for her" (Gal. ii.). These grand words come to the mind of a Catholic when he raises his eyes and looks aloft to the Roman Church, the mother and teacher of all the churches of the globe. The lamentations of Jeremiah are inadequate to give expression to his sorrow, when this Jerusalem, "the ruler of nations," "the Queen of the Provinces is robbed of her freedom."

The Roman Church then must be free; free in the person of her Bishop, the head of the Church. But now if the Pope has received from God the *right* to exercise his sublime office most fully and without molestation, he thereby also has a right to the *means* necessary for the perfecting of that liberty; he has a right to determine and demand them. These means may differ as times and circumstances change. We are only concerned with one of them now—the Temporal Power of the Popes.

Assuming then, as true, the doctrine of the Primacy, (*a*) *common sense* must tell every one, that the Pope is truly free *in Rome* when he is in no way subject there to another, in no way dependent upon another; that moreover, this independence has its safest guarantee, and is most effectually secure against every extraneous influence, when the Pope himself is likewise the temporal ruler of Rome.

If we consult (*b*) *history* we are told that the Popes after the division of the Roman Empire, and since the fifth century, possessed some political power in Rome, which subsequently developed into a truly regal power, and that the Popes during eleven centuries held and exercised that power.

Now the (c) *Christian concept* of the Church and of Divine Providence tells us that God "who loves nothing dearer than the freedom of his Church" (St. Bernard), thus shaped events that the freedom of the Head of the Church should be made secure by his Temporal Power, "singulari scilicet prorsus divinae Providentiae consilio factum est, ut Romano Imperio in plura regna variasque ditiones diviso, Romanus Pontifex civilem principatum haberet."¹

Furthermore the (d) *events* of the last twenty years sadly but unmistakably prove, that the Pope is no longer free to exercise his office in Rome in a manner becoming its importance and dignity; since Victor Emmanuel forcibly entered by the Porta Pia and took possession of Rome as King of Italy; since the Pope in spite of all guarantees is completely dependent upon government measures and the whims of ministers, Chambers of Parliament, and the rabble; in fine, since he is at the mercy and good pleasure of others.

Lastly, we know from the clear and positive (e) *utterances of the Popes* themselves, "that the Temporal Power of the Pope is *necessary* at present in order that he may, freely and independently, of any power or secular prince, rule and guide the entire Church."

The last reason alone would be more than sufficient.

The Pope is the competent judge in this question. Every Catholic must accept humbly his declaration. But we add, and Pius IX. emphasized it in the allocution quoted above, that the *Episcopacy* of the whole world more than once has repeated these same declarations of the Head of the Church.

It is not incumbent upon a Catholic, therefore, to defend the Temporal Power *because* the Pope was the legitimate prince of Rome, who was unjustifiably and violently despoiled of his temporal possessions. No, the real and true reason why Catholics defend the Temporal Power is a deeper one: They defend the liberty of the Pope inasmuch as he is Pope, *i.e.*, inasmuch as he is lawfully constituted the Head of the Church by Jesus Christ. It is a question, therefore, of defending that liberty and independence to which the divine Founder of the Church has given His Representative an inalienable right. In defending his rights he is defending our rights as Catholics. The means to preserve intact this freedom is the temporal dominion. Therefore our conclusion runs thus: Just as no power on earth has the slightest right to destroy the freedom of the sovereign Pontiff, which God wills, so also no emperor, no king, no people, has any right whatever to deprive the Pope of the temporal power which he needs

¹ Allocution of Pius IX., "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849. Letter of Leo XIII. to Card. Rampolla.

² Allocution of Pius IX., "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862; Leo XIII., l. c.

and must have to govern the Church with the freedom willed by Christ. The sovereign freedom of the successor of St. Peter is to-day necessarily conditioned by his temporal sovereignty; therefore the latter, through the former, is rendered sacred and inviolable; and *to attack it, is to assail Christ Himself, in the person of His representative.*

Therefore Victor Emmanuel had no more right to deprive the Pope of his Papal States than had Napoleon I.; therefore the occupation of Rome will ever be a sacrilege no matter by what people it was effected. We say a *sacrilege*, for such in very truth it is: "peccatum contra *immunitatem loci sacri*," and as *prescription* has no force against "*res sacræ*" and "*jura ecclesiastica*," so also the spoliation of Rome cannot be legalized by any title whatever. Hence the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" places the ban of Excommunication (*speciali modo Romano Pontifici reservata*) upon, "*Invadentes, destruentes, detinentes vel per se vel per alios civitates, terras, loca, aut jura ad Ecclesiam Romanam pertinentes, vel usurpantes, perturbantes, retinentes supremam jurisdictionem in eis nec non ad singula praedicta, auxilium, consilium, favorem praebeantes.*" "On all who either themselves or through others invade, destroy, retain the cities, lands, places or rights belonging to the Roman Church, or who usurp, disturb, retain supreme jurisdiction therein; also on all who give help, counsel, favor to any of the aforesaid things." (I. 12). Is this excommunication of itself not sufficiently expressive for every Catholic, who knows that it is the *severest* ecclesiastical punishment, and always presupposes grave sin? Can there be any right or any principle to justify that sin? Knowing this must not every Catholic openly condemn the *invasio* and *detentio*? Unless he does so he is in direct opposition with the Pope and with himself. Solicitude for the maintenance of a so-called political or national principle would then *lead to the denial of an undeniable Catholic principle!*¹

¹ A remark of St. Thomas on a similar subject may appropriately illustrate these deductions. The Angelical Doctor, as is well known, along with the majority of mediæval theologians defends the opinion that civil authority proceeds immediately from the people. Treating on the laws and customs of the Old Testament he makes the objection: "With the Jews the election of rulers was not sufficiently provided for, since no direction had been given to the people in this regard." He answers the objection as follows: "Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod populus ille sub speciali cura Dei regebatur: unde dicitur (*Deut. vii., 6.*): Te elegit dominus Deus tuus ut sis ei populus peculiaris Et ideo institutionem summi principis . . . electionem regis non commisit Dominus populo, sed sibi reservavit, ut patet (*Deut. xvii., 15*): Eum constitues regem quem Dominus Deus tuus elegerit." * I. 2. q. 105, a. 1. Hence according to Aquinas

* "That people was governed under the special care of God; whence it is said (*Deut. vii. 6*) 'The Lord thy God has chosen thee to be His peculiar people,' therefore the Lord did not commit the election of the supreme ruler, the choice of the king to the people, but reserved it to Himself, as is clear from *Deut. xvii. 15*, 'Thou shalt set him king whom the Lord thy God shall choose.' "

It is our duty to speak plainly and forcibly. On the Roman question the religious side is and remains for us the main point. Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens will not recognize this argument as the only true one, because they reject the religious principles on which it is grounded. They deny moreover *all* spiritual sovereignty of the Pope; hence, *a fortiori*, his "right to independence." But they cannot gainsay our right to remain true and loyal to our religious principles. Do we Catholics enjoy only a partial or an imperfect liberty of conscience? They cannot but respect consistency; while shameful compromise and cowardly faint-heartedness will surely not gain their esteem. Let us cling, therefore, above all, to the great American principle that we are free citizens and esteem Religious Liberty above all else. Let us proclaim it clearly and positively: Yes, as Americans we hold firmly to our Constitution, to "the right of self-government" and "republican principles. We believe also that in general, civil authority comes only mediately from God and immediately from the people; but we also hold that there may be other legitimate titles to this authority. We have neither the right nor the intention to impose our views on others. Just as it is not contradictory to *our* "republican principles" that monarchies exist *elsewhere*, so also we cannot reject *a priori* a Constitution that does not recognize the sovereignty of the people. In any case, not even the most sovereign people in the world can have a right to violate the ordinances of God. But we Catholics behold in the Papacy an immediate institution of God, and in the Temporal Power the necessary condition of the divinely-ordained freedom of the Pope! Therefore, according to Catholic principles, there is no right in the world, the right of self-government not excepted, which can destroy that freedom. Hence we may also apply to the Roman question:

"*Quod Deus conjunxit homo non separet!*"

"What God hath joined let not man put asunder!"

there could be no question about the election of a ruler—about the exercise of the sovereignty of the people in the proper sense of the term—because there can be no right of the people *against the ordinances of God*. Now we say a *pari* or *ab analago*: God provides in a special manner for His "*populus peculiaris*," the *Holy Catholic Church*, and in her more especially for the Roman Church, whose Bishop by His express command was to be the successor of St. Peter—the Head of the Church. By the *providentia specialis Dei* it came about that also the temporal sovereignty over Rome was given to the successors of St. Peter, in order that they might exercise freely and independently their sublime office. Hence with regard to the Roman people it is true that since they are the objects of God's special providence, *He has not committed to them the election of a ruler, but has reserved to Himself, i.e., to his Church, the right to determine, by the election of the Pope, the person who is to be the King of Rome.*

We will conclude this part of our argument with the words of Brownson, who was ever proud of being an American citizen, and whom all Americans claim as their own: "It is enough to say that the Pope never was a subject of any temporal prince, and *never can be*. He represents Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. He is above all earthly monarchs, by the law of Christ; . . . the status of prince belongs to him by right of his office as Vicar of Christ, for by that office he is declared independent, and clothed with plenary authority to govern all men and nations in all things relating to salvation."¹ "The Roman or ecclesiastical state was a donation to the Holy See or to the Church of Rome. Gifts to the Church are gifts to God, and when made are the property, under Him, of the spirituality, which by no laws, heathen, Jewish, or Christian, can be deprived of their possession or use without sacrilege. They are sacred to religious uses, and can no longer, without the consent of the spirituality, be diverted to temporal uses, without *adding sacrilege to robbery*. Whoso attacks the spirituality attacks God. The temporal power of the Pope is therefore not within the category of any earthly human government, but is the property of the spirituality. Victor Emmanuel, in despoiling the Pope, has usurped Church property, property given to God, and sacred to religious uses. The deed, which our eminent jurists and Protestant divines sympathize with and applaud, strikes a blow at the spirituality, at the sacredness of all Church property, of Protestant churches as well as of Catholic churches,—at the sacredness of all eleemosynary gifts and asserts the right of power when strong enough to divert them from the purposes of the donors . . . Or are they (the Protestant divines) so intent on crushing the Papacy that they are quite willing to cut their own throats?"

B.—Salus Publica Suprema Lex.

We cheerfully admit this principle. It does not militate against the re-establishment of the Temporal Power, but is rather a confirmation of its usefulness and necessity. It shows both in a brighter and clearer light. Let us therefore briefly consider its essence and the deductions made from it in the light of Christian jurisprudence and according to the teaching of Christian moralists.

The common good is to be placed above that of the individual;

¹ See vol. 12, *Pope and Emperor*, p. 456.

² See vol. 18, *Sardinia and the Holy Father*, p. 451. This article carries the greater weight with it, because it was written in 1871, a year after the spoliation of the Holy See, and in order to refute the arguments of Dr. Thompson and other Protestants who pretended to defend the "sovereignty of the Roman people," saying that the sovereignty of the Roman State "is in the category of all earthly sovereignties."

hence duties towards society precede, generally speaking, those towards self. The temporal welfare of the people is the immediate end of civil society. Governmental *régime* exists not for its own sake, but for the people. A change of government or a change in the form of government, brought about by any event whatsoever, *may* be legitimate, even though effected by unlawful means. It suffices that the former state of affairs may have become hurtful or impossible, and that, accordingly, the welfare of the entire society requires the subsequent situation to be upheld by all. Even he who does not admit the lawfulness of our Revolutionary War with Great Britain, or the Belgian revolution in 1830, must declare that the forms of government thus brought about are perfectly legitimate. But if the above conditions are not verified, the members of such a society may tolerate the change of government, but cannot directly lend their aid to confirm or maintain it.

If the claims of *different societies* be compared, precedence, *ceteris paribus*, must be given to the highest and most important. Since every society is made up of a number of rational beings to secure a more or less determined end, it is evident, that the dignity of a society depends upon the loftiness of its end and on the greater number of intelligent beings who are striving for that end. This truth must ever be borne in mind when considering civil and religious society, the State and the Church.

The State has for its immediate end the temporal welfare of its subjects; the Church, the eternal welfare, the salvation of mankind. Inasmuch as eternal salvation is of far greater importance, nay more necessary, than temporal happiness, by so much the Church, the mediator of eternal happiness, by divine appointment, must take precedence in dignity over every civil society. There exists therefore a true subordination of the State to the Church, and the Church cannot be made subservient to the State, and no perishable temporal considerations can prevent her from using the necessary means to attain her sublime end.

The ecclesiastical as well as the civil power are both supreme in their respective domains; but, though each has its own sphere, both should act conjointly for the welfare of humanity; they should mutually assist one another. But the Church, because of her exalted end, is superior to the State, "as the soul is superior to the body, as the sky is above the earth" (St. Chrysostom). "Or should the spirit give place to the flesh, the celestial to the terrestrial?" (St. Gregory Naz.).

Moreover, the Church surpasses also in excellence the civil organization of any people or nation, because her organization embraces a wider field. Her welfare, is the welfare of all her children who are scattered over the entire globe; nay more, that of all men, for whom she was instituted.

This is why, in case of a conflict between Church and State—*e.g.*, when both claim jurisdiction for their respective ends—precedence must be given to the Church. This is no “individual theory.” It is catholic teaching, which can be proven by sound reason and which Leo XIII., in union with the Fathers and theologians, has clearly and distinctly explained.¹

Suppose, that the temporal advantages of a nation come in conflict with the welfare of the Church, to which that nation belongs, or hinders the Church in the attainment of her end, then evidently that nation must make its temporal interests subservient to the higher interest of the Church—which is identical with the nation’s own higher interests—and with the higher interests of the faithful at large.²

These are the conclusions which faith and reason draw from the principle “*Salus publica suprema lex.*”

I.—THE WELFARE OF THE WHOLE CHURCH DEMANDS THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

The objection brought against this principle when applied to the Roman question may be stated thus, in clear terms :

“Private interests must give way when there is a question of public welfare or of the common good.

“Now, the welfare of the Romans and Italians, that is, the public welfare of Italy, demands the maintenance of the present political situation of their country; consequently the Pope’s temporal power must be permanently abolished. It is therefore the Pope’s duty to renounce his claims to temporal sovereignty, or at least, Catholics need not strive to reestablish it.”

The first proposition is true, but it proves just the contrary of what our opponents deduce from it.

Facts show the second proposition to be false; *but even granted it be true*, it would prove nothing against us. Hence, in any case, the conclusion is false. We prove this as follows :

As temporal welfare must be subordinate to the spiritual, so likewise must the incidental claims of a single nation be subordinate to the demands of the Church and the Catholic world at large. Now the Roman question means the security of a spiritual good,

¹ Particularly in the Encyclicals “*Immortale Dei*,” “*Quod Apostolici Muneris*,” “*Humanum Genus*,” “*Diuturnum*.” There is no need of citing authors in confirmation of the above-mentioned principles; they may be found in any treatise on Christian Jurisprudence. Cf. especially Card Hergenröther, *Staat und Kirche*, viii., “*Die Lehre von der Superiorität der Kirche und ihrer Gewalt über das Zeitliche*.”

² On the subject, “How the Church, notwithstanding her higher aim, or rather by means of it, promotes the temporal well-being of nations,” Cf. Encyclical of Leo XIII., “*Humanum Genus*.”

the security of ecclesiastical liberty, through the territorial independence of the Head of the Church; a claim most intimately associated with the well-being of the Church and the interests of two hundred millions of Catholics.

Hence *Salus rei publicæ Christianæ suprema lex!*

Rome, therefore, belongs to the Church, to her visible Head, and therefore to the whole Catholic world! The Papal States are the incontestable heritage of the common father of Christendom, the "patrimonium Petri." Romans and Italians have no right to rob Rome of its essential character, that of the centre of the Church, the Capitol of the Catholic world! Even though their claims be unanimous; even though they gained thereby a national advantage by despoiling the Pope, and subjecting the Vicar of Christ to a temporal king!

Italy, therefore, has the obligation towards the Pope, towards the Church, towards the Catholics of the whole world, to restore to the Pope that liberty and independence indispensable to the government of the Church, viz., his Temporal Power.

This is the unbending logic of philosophy, the logic of the ecclesiastical standpoint, the logic of Catholic consciousness.

The following proposition stands out clearly in the light of present events: In order to enjoy *sovereign liberty*, as the Head of the Church, the Pope must be a *temporal sovereign*. Only lately three enemies of the Papacy furnished eloquent commentaries upon the outrageous occurrences of last October—commentaries that must come home forcibly to the blindest adherents of Nationalism and Modernism. They were the speech of Minister *Rudini* at Milan; the circular of the Jew *Lemmi*, the Grand-Master of Italian Freemasonry, to the Italian: "Brethren," and the agitation of the demagogue, *Menotti Garibaldi*, against the so-called Guarantee-Law.

True it is, that the Church will survive, as some timid persons are fond of saying, though days of worse captivity and still greater affliction be in store for the venerable sufferer in the chair of St. Peter. She lived through ages of persecution when almost all her Popes reddened the chair of St. Peter with their life's blood. And she will live through the same ordeal again, by virtue of the Divine life dwelling within her. But are these the sentiments of a child realizing the sublime dignity of its mother? Is this the language of one who glories in his faith and is proud of being a Catholic? Every true Catholic understands the "*non possumus*" of the successor of St. Peter in an entirely different sense; and from deep conviction, proclaims with him, that "the Temporal Power of the Pope is at the present time not only *useful* but *necessary* for the liberty of the Church." Necessary, because the

Church has not only a right to live, but also the right to live free and unmolested! Necessary, because she has not merely the right to conceal herself in the catacombs, under the surveillance of a Questor, by the grace of the State, but she has the right to show her everlastingly youthful, beautiful and venerable countenance to all people! Because she has not merely the right to pass by the palaces of the mighty in the ragged garb of a poor servant maid, a beggar imploring a place of shelter, but she has the right to pass majestically through human society, a royal personage with power to command and a gracious blessing for all, a queen adorned with that royal crown which the eternal King placed on her brow when he purchased her, on the Cross, at the price of His Precious Blood!

II.—THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORAL POWER, A BENEFIT TO ITALY ITSELF.

It only remains for us to show in a brief way that in the Roman question it cannot be said that Rome and Italy must sacrifice their temporal advantage for the common good of Christianity. The opposite is true. We will only mention the following facts:

a. It is not true that the overthrow of the Pope's Temporal Power was the work of the Roman or Italian people, and that the present situation fulfils the desire of the *people*. We do not mean that the Italians may not be justly reproached for lack of energy in proclaiming their Catholic sentiments. Nevertheless, Leo XIII. gave expression to the truth, on different occasions, when he said, that the great majority of the Italian people faithfully adhered to the Roman See. It was the confirmation of this fact, by the grand demonstration of October 1, 1891, in St. Peter's, when with 20,000 pilgrims, not less than 40,000 Romans and Italians knelt at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, that induced the Grand Master Lemmi to issue an impassioned circular.¹

b. Far from having promoted the welfare of Rome and Italy, the proclamation of Italian Unity has caused it to suffer greatly and has well nigh ruined it. Rome and all Italy are suffering from the "*mal di Roma*," the Roman plague, that is, financial embarrassment and poverty, the outcome of the mania for political ascendancy. The straits in which New Italy finds herself, plainly

¹ The well-known liberal deputy, Fazzeri, presented the following programme to his constituents: "The reconciliation between the Roman See and our Government is the highest need, the most urgent necessity and the sincerest wish of our Fatherland." He was elected to Parliament by an immense majority. Distinguished conservatives wrote to him: "*All Italians feel the truth of your resolution*, but few have the courage to declare it openly to the official world." Cf. "*la Conciliazione tra il Papato e l'Italia*." Florence, 1887.

verifies the saying of Thiers: "*Qui mange du Pape en meurt*," "To eat of the Pope is death." The Italians, whose sensitiveness in money matters is proverbial, understand the practical application of the well-known adage: "*la farina del diavolo va tutta in crusea*;" "The devil's meal all turns into bran." Even those, who out of inborn cowardice join in the cry "*Evviva l' Italia unita*," will tell a stranger in a significant and plaintive way: "*Si stava meglio quando si stava peggio*." "We fared much better when we were worse off."

A living proof of what kind of blessing the new kingdom showers on Italy's population, is the great mass of poverty-stricken Italian emigrants who daily land on our shores.¹

c. National honor and glory! That Providence selected Italy for the seat of the Papacy, is her fairest fame, her greatest glory! It was the Pope who added the most celebrated pages to Italy's history. The glorious traditions of the land, its splendid achievements in the domain of science and the arts, all are to this day most intimately connected with the names of the Popes.²

d. Even from an international standpoint, Italy's great misfortune is and will be the Roman question. Without Crispi's notorious declarations, his angry speeches and his frivolous article in the "*North American Review*," it is as clear as day-light to the unbiased mind that Italy keeps an immense standing army, which consumes millions and millions, for no other purpose than to guard her spoils against the protestations of the Catholic world. For that very reason the Roman question will always be a question of the day, despite the efforts and tricks of diplomacy, until the sacred right of St. Peter's successor is restored to him. Never will the two hundred million children of the Pope cease to accuse Italy of the crime committed against their common father, and demand back his freedom. They will be louder in their claims, the longer the Head of the Church is kept in prison. The world's legions of soldiery are not able to smother the voice of the Pontiffs and deaden the ring of its echo, in the hearts of the faithful and prevent its re-echo from their lips. And now can there be any question about the lawlessness of a state of affairs, which leaves to so many subjects of the usurper the only alternative, either to transgress a religious duty, to refuse obedience to the Church and the Vicar of Christ, or, to look upon the Italian kingdom in its present form as the enemy of the Holy See and of the Church? We say "*Italy in its present form*"; for the union of all under the

¹ Cf. "*La question Romaine au point de vue financier*," Office of the Osservatore Catholico, Milan.

² Leo XIII. to the Italian Bishops, February 15, 1882.

sway of the King of Piedmont is not at all a necessary condition for the oneness of the nation! Were the Popes ever opposed to a federative union of Italy? Did not the united cities of the land in earlier times find precisely in the Papacy their most active representative, protector and defender? And now, to conclude: Would not united Italy be powerful enough without Rome? Would it not, above all, be a more blissful Union?

e. Would it not be a benefit, in the word's truest sense, to the world, to all civilized nations, if the Popes should again be universally acknowledged and appealed to as the arbitrators in international differences?

But in order that all nations and in every instance, may resort to such an arbiter and peace-maker, with full confidence, he needs must be entirely independent, a prince himself, in his own free right. Who is there who does not pray for such an arbitrator? All, including the enemies of the Church, must admit that there can be no person better qualified for that sacred trust than the Pope. Therefore the *salus publica*, the public common good of humanity in this regard too, demands his perfect freedom and liberty.

III.—WASHINGTON, D. C., AND ROME.

The relation of the District of Columbia to the United States strikingly resembles the relation of Rome to the Catholic Church. Space will only allow us simply to indicate the line of thought. The Constitution explicitly states that "Congress shall exercise *exclusive legislative power in all cases whatever* over a district" set apart for the government of the nation.¹ Now, the inhabitants of the District of Columbia are more numerous than those of certain States; nevertheless they have no representatives in Congress, no right to vote on national issues in the district; not even the right to elect municipal officers. The *proximate* reason of such a wise measure is the *independence* of the legislative and ruling power of the United States; the *ultimate* reason: the welfare of all the States, of the *whole country*! We ask: Did the decree of 1801 ask the consent of the Washingtonians? By no means. Are the people of Washington "sovereign?" Can they *change* this article of the Constitution, even if its population of 200,000 unanimously demanded it? Not at all. What would be the answer of Congress, of all Americans, to such claims? Simply this: it is *an honor and a privilege* for Washington to be the capital of the United States; but its citizens must sacrifice some political rights exercised by other citizens, because: *salus publica suprema lex! the welfare of the whole country demands it!*

¹ Constitution of the United States, xvii. clause, 8th sect, 1st art.

We say *a pari* and *a fortiori*: According to the *divine* Constitution of the Church, Rome is the centre and capital of the Catholic world, the seat of government of the Church. Hence the Roman Pontiff must have "*exclusive* legislative power" over Rome! Therefore Italy is honored with the highest privilege of Divine Providence, but it has at the same time the sacred duty towards all Catholic nations, towards Catholics of the whole world, to sacrifice certain political or national rights, if there should be such, in order to insure the complete independence of the Pope and thereby the well-being of the whole Catholic Church.¹

CONCLUSION.

The re-establishment of the Temporal Power therefore can in no way and in no sense be injurious to Rome or to Italy. Is a re-establishment *possible*? History has answered this question over and over again in the most unequivocal manner. Our own century has been the witness, both in 1815 and 1849 of how wonderfully God directs His Church in troublesome times, and prepares new triumphs for her in her persecuted Head. We therefore do not ask: *when* will God hear the supplications of the Catholic world for its captive father? *how*, under the present circumstances, Providence will again give to the Bishop of Rome the temporal sway over the eternal city? will it be brought about amicably and peacefully? or must the crime against the Vicar of Christ be expiated in blood? God alone knows.² "Never was the papal independency more seriously threatened than now, since the conversion of the

¹ Rev. H. A. Brann, D.D., in his learned pamphlet, *The Schism of the West* draws the following just conclusion about the *election* of the Pope: "We learn from this schism how dangerous it is to the peace of the Church to permit any secular power to have influence in the Conclave. The election of the Pope should be absolutely free so as to forestall excuses for schism. Hence the place of the Conclave should be subject to no prince. The Popes should be temporal sovereigns; their territory, be it great or small, absolutely inviolable; and in that territory the Conclave ought to be held. The Schism of the West furnishes arguments for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. There are some, I know, who dream of a possible spiritual independence of the Papacy, without temporal power. But we ask when or where the Popes were absolutely free, *de jure* and *de facto*, except when they were temporal sovereigns. They should be perfectly free *de jure* as well as *de facto*, and this is only possible with the temporal power restored. All the facts of history are against the platonic dream of a spiritual independence of the papacy when it is subject to king, kaiser or mob. The restoration of the temporal power is therefore a necessary guarantee to the freedom of the Conclave. The attempt of Crispi, the late prime-minister of the king of Sardinia, to get a pledge from the *Dreibund* to coerce the future Conclave to elect a Pope who would sanction Sardinian usurpation, shows what is to be expected of any civil government which can claim the Pope as a subject."—*The Schism of the West and the Freedom of Papal Elections*, New York, Benziger Brothers, 1882, p. 30, 31.

² Divine Providence does not recognize the so-called "principle of non-intervention," and God has not yet emancipated the world.

Roman empire. Never was the *duty of defending it more urgent, and never was it more necessary that all loyal Catholics should be on the alert to discover and defeat the machinations of the politicians,*" said Brownson, writing in 1861. ("Pope and Emperor," vol. 12, p. 457, seq.) It would certainly be desirable that a settlement be effected by *Italy herself* or at least *with Italy's co-operation*. Such a solution, humanly speaking, would in every respect be more advantageous and more lasting.

In the meantime, it is the duty of Catholics in every land, now that Rudini in his speech has shown himself a master in political hypocrisy, to openly, positively and persistently urge the rightful demands of the Catholic world. Just claims do not secure a hearing in any other way nowadays. In this way alone does a numerical minority gain public recognition. Those who stand aside and only call upon heaven to witness their protest, will never prevent the usurping power from calling for the order of the day. The more active and vigorous *international action* is, in this case, the heavier will be its weight with the governments, the more powerful its efficacy, the more speedy its success. Again, the more outspoken Catholics are in a country where they enjoy greater liberty, the greater will be their influence upon public opinion. This shows how true the statement is, that a Catholic Congress cannot be thought of to-day, in which the condition of the Holy Father is not made the common subject of discussion and of most eloquent protestation. Therefore the Holy Father heartily welcomed the idea of an international Catholic Congress on the Roman question. It will be most eminently a Congress of Peace. Let us meanwhile follow the noble example which the Holy Father gives us. "We place our trust in God," said Leo XIII. in an address, "and are determined to contend with all our might for the freedom of the Church and its Head. . . . We are moreover not alone in this conflict." No, Holy Father, you are not alone in this conflict! Your devoted bishops and priests, all your faithful children pray and protest with you! Our trust, like yours, is in the Lord, who above all else, loves the freedom of His Church! The day will come, the longed-for day of deliverance! The successor of the Prince of the Apostles will again ascend the venerable throne which centuries erected for the Papacy, to shed new lustre upon the Church, to spread over all the world the beneficent influence of the apostolic word, to be free again to bestow his blessing without let or hindrance, upon the Eternal City and the entire world, *Urbi et Orbi!*

JOSEPH SHROEDER, D.D.

OUR YOUNG MEN—WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR
THEM ?

EVERY one knows that for a long time this question about the young men has been before the public. Societies for their benefit, societies founded and conducted on lines quite different, in many respects, from those of purely religious sodalities, have been established. Much attention has been given to these organizations. In many places they have been joined together in Diocesan Unions for mutual improvement. They have even a large, strong and active National Union, the object of which is, and has been for years, to assert in trumpet tones the necessity of these associations; to urge their establishment in every parish, if possible, throughout the whole country; to bring to their aid the sympathy and the co-operation of the pastors, of laymen of distinction, wealth and experience, and even of the bishops themselves.

The movement is already very large. Those who believe in it believe with their whole hearts. The annual gatherings of the National Union have been invariably blessed by the Holy Father himself. The most illustrious prelates in the land have not hesitated to give their cordial approbation. Bishop Keane, now the Rector of the American Catholic University, Mgr. Preston, the late Vicar-General of New York, Mgr. Doane, then Vicar-General of Newark, Father Mitchell, now the Vicar-General of Brooklyn, have been among the Presidents of the National Union. Cardinal McCloskey blessed and favored it during his life. His successor, the illustrious Archbishop Corrigan, has many times expressed his hearty co-operation with the movement, and he officially appoints the President of the Diocesan Union in New York. Cardinal Gibbons honored the opening of the sixteenth convention, held in Washington, in October, 1890, with his presence. He made there one of the most ringing and eloquent of his speeches, applauding the work of the delegates and giving them every encouragement that could be accorded to the propagators of a great work. The Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, performed a similar office for the seventeenth convention, held in the City of Brotherly Love, in October, 1891. No one who was present on the occasion, and who heard the fervid eloquence and the convincing logic of the argument made by America's greatest preacher, could ever doubt for a moment the utility of the work he so splendidly commended. The Archbishops of Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, St. Paul, and

Oregon have all publicly declared their interest and approval. There is scarcely a bishop in the country who has not at some time or other given open expression to his earnest desire that these societies for the young men be established and that they grow and flourish like the bay tree. But the loudest voice of all is that of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. Here are its words: "We consider as worthy of particular encouragement associations for the promotion of healthful social union among Catholics, and especially those whose aim is to guard our Catholic young men against the dangerous influences, and to supply them with means of innocent amusement and mental culture. It is obvious that our young men are exposed to the greatest dangers and they need the most abundant helps. Hence, in the spirit of our Holy Father, Leo the XIII., we desire to see the number of thoroughly Catholic and well organized associations for their benefit greatly increased, especially in our large cities. We exhort pastors to consider the formation and careful direction of such societies as one of their most important duties. And we appeal to our young men to put to good profit the best years of their lives, by combining together under the direction of their pastors, for mutual improvement and encouragement in the paths of faith and of virtue.

"And in order to acknowledge the great amount of good that the Catholic young men of the National Union have accomplished; to promote the growth of the Union, and to stimulate its members to greater efforts in the future; we cordially bless their aims and endeavors, and we recommend the Union to all our Catholic young men."

This recommendation, so wisely worded, so logical in its premises and conclusions, coming from an authority than which there is nothing higher or greater on earth (for it must not be forgotten that the Acts of the Council were revised and approved by the Holy Father himself), should be enough to settle forever all questions as to the advisability and the utility of these societies.

Nevertheless, it will do no harm to review the field a little. Extrinsic evidence is surely very weighty. But a man never loves anything so well as when he sees its intrinsic merit by the light of his own intellect. Therefore, let us inquire, first, what is the necessity for this work; secondly, what has been done thus far; thirdly, what can be reasonably hoped for in the future?

What is the necessity? Young men encounter more temptations than any other class of people. Men who have passed the years of early youth, who are married, who have families growing up about them, to whom they must, through every motive of self-interest, show good example, can easily lead moral lives and be good Catholics, provided, of course, they do not go astray during

the years when their adult life was beginning. As for woman, God has made her a natural priestess. Her character is such that, under ordinary circumstances, she will be, without difficulty, a model of faith, modesty, sobriety and patience to the world. She has comparatively few temptations and she is surrounded by safeguards on every side.

But the young man is the one whose position is really dangerous. Pleasure, drink, ambition pursue him like wolves. Unfortunately, he is as free as the bird of the air. He can go where he will. He may read, hear, see everything. If he be rich and high-placed he is tempted to underestimate the value of his heritage of faith by the fact that such a great majority in the upper stratum of society are not yet Catholics. If he be poor, it may seem to him that all the short roads to wealth and prominence lead through Protestantism and Infidelity. Whether he be rich or poor, the gilded palaces of drink and sin hold for him always wide-open doors. But why prolong this narration? Every pastor of souls, every father of a family, every man who has passed through the dangerous years, and who recollects his own temptations, knows perfectly well the perils that beset the period of life of which we are speaking. And few there are who can restrain a tear as they remember the sad wrecks from among their own early companions and friends, who stranded on this treacherous shore.

We want therefore, something that will prove a safeguard against these dangers, a breakwater that will keep our golden youth outside the line of the shallows and the shoals. We need something which will preserve their attachment to the Church, to their bishops and their pastors; something that will save their hearts from corruption and their minds from blight, during those years when the character of their temptations is such as to make them, at first, afraid of the Sacraments: and later on, anxious for a pretext to abandon that faith which is so galling to the natural inclinations of their hearts.

But will not the schools do this? No human tongue or pen can ever adequately praise the work done by our Catholic schools. No amount of appreciation can ever be too great for those devoted bishops, pastors and people, for those illustrious children of St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Vincent de Paul and blessed de la Salle, who, in spite of the greatest difficulties, in the face of poverty and of prejudice, notwithstanding opposition from without and from within, pushed on bravely the work of the schools and made them what they are to-day, the palladium of Catholicity in this land. May God's blessing rest on them and on their efforts. May their success go on increasing and spreading with every day. It can never be greater than it deserves to be. But the school

cannot do all. Many children are obliged to leave school at an early age to earn their daily bread. Practically, all finish their school training by the time that manhood has begun to dawn. The principles of Christian faith, of manly honor, of true virtue remain in their hearts. But the hottest iron cools rapidly when exposed to frosty air. And in the same way human hearts grow cold; they lose the principles which made them warm when exposed to the icy blast of the bad, scoffing, jeering world. We must look then for something to supplement the school house, to continue, to perfect and to preserve its work.

Will purely religious Sodalities supply this want? Can you imagine a conflagration going on at the top of a quite high building, and the firemen laboring most devotedly to extinguish the flames with a stream of water which falls just short of where the fire is raging? The stream is not by any means useless. It does much good. It dampens the parts of the building it is able to reach, and prevents them from being, later on, destroyed. But it never can extinguish the fire. The writer has the greatest possible respect for purely religious Sodalities. He has established them, and cultivated them with the utmost care. They preserve in innocence and uprightness of heart all who join and remain faithful to them. But he cannot help feeling that their operation is much like that of the stream of water which does not reach the place of the fire. The great majority will not join them. And the great majority are those among whom the conflagration is raging, those whom we wish to reach, those whom we *must* reach if we desire to do our duty thoroughly. Consequently, we must look further for our remedy.

Will Temperance Societies do the work? Who does not know the evils wrought by drink? It is the most dangerous of all temptations to our young men. The greater part of our crime and nearly all our *abject* poverty come directly or indirectly from drunkenness. If you desire any proof as regards the crime, you need but scan carefully the terrible records to be found in any of our daily newspapers, reading between the lines, to get at the causes of things. Should you have any doubts regarding the poverty, consult any practical member of our St. Vincent de Paul Societies. They will tell you of the blighted lives, the broken hearts, the wrecked careers, the tear-stained eyes, the souls lost to country, Church, Heaven and God, through the instrumentality of this dreadful demon, which they have met in the course of their ministrations of mercy. This does not mean that the widow and the orphan who are thrown upon the charity of the world for support have been slaves of drink themselves. But it means, oh, so often, that they were brought to misery and to want by the drunken habits of

the husband, father, brother or son, who otherwise would have been their mainstay and support.

There is no man of right mind or disposition who would not readily and willingly do everything in his power to put an end to this great evil. The Temperance Societies have done very much in this direction. They are worthy of all the encouragement they can possibly receive. Their organizers are men of intelligence, self-sacrifice and zeal. Nevertheless, here again we meet the former difficulty. Viewing the effect of their work from its present condition, and from the experience of the past, we know that an extremely large number can never be induced to join them. Consequently, we must look elsewhere again for the remedy we are seeking.

What then is this remedy? It is the establishment, wherever practicable, of associations for the young men in which the rising generation will be supplied with all lawful and innocent amusements, and to which they will be positively attracted by the pleasure in them to be found; in which they can, if so disposed, improve their education; where they may be bound together socially, that they may know, respect, love and assist one another; where the pastor of the church or his delegated assistant will visit them regularly, thus attaching them to the Church and to the priests, keeping them regular in their attendance at Mass and the Sacraments, saving them from the street, the saloon and the dive.

The theory is certainly most beautiful. Could its results be made to equal its capabilities and its *prima facie* promises, it would, in a single generation, produce fruit that would make the Catholic Church in the United States the wonder and the admiration of the world. Let us see what it has accomplished thus far.

It is now probably more than forty years since the idea of the young men's societies was first broached in this country. The writer does not know and has not been able to ascertain the name of its first projector. But certainly among its earliest propagators were Mgr. Doane, of Newark, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. McQuade, then also of New Jersey, and now the Rt. Reverend Bishop of Rochester, New York. The pioneer founders were wonderfully enthusiastic. The logic of the situation was so clear that they felt as though they had struck a spiritual gold mine. The results did not always equal their expectations. The young men were often found phlegmatic, indisposed to work, and easily tempted to overstep the rules which the pastor felt himself called upon to make for the prevention of abuses. More than a few of the associations collapsed within some years after their establishment. And it happened sometimes that those who had been the most enthusiastic supporters of the idea lost heart, coming to the conclusion that the young

men as a body were a set upon whom the labor was wasted, and that the plan of improving them by means of the societies was nothing but an idle, even if beautiful, dream. Nevertheless, the idea would not down. A good and practical idea is immortal. It may undergo modifications. It may change very much in form. It may seem at times to be weak and drooping. But death comes to it never.

As old supporters fell off new ones took their places. Besides, many societies lived and flourished from the very beginning. Were there not danger of making invidious distinctions through the mentioning of names, it would be easy to cite here many instances of organizations that have gone on improving from the very day of their birth. Moreover, people began to see that where failure did come, the causes were always traceable and avoidable by those who cared to learn. Sometimes it was the fault of the young men. Other times it was the fault of the Spiritual Director. In other cases it was shared by both. But in no case was the fault intentional. *Mistake* would be the word rather than *fault*. And the foundation reason for the mistakes was that neither party thoroughly understood the other. But as a better understanding began to grow, so did the societies increase, not only in numbers, but also in utility. Besides, the associations were always poor financially. The word poverty is a term very often misapplied. It is hard to see that the millionaire is more really wealthy than the laboring man, provided the latter have plenty of work, with reasonable pay therefor, and sufficient means to clothe, house and feed himself and his family. Indeed, add contentment to the laborer's life and you make him, in thousands of instances, by far the wealthier man of the two. But poverty, real poverty, downright want is a very evil thing to bear. Often does it freeze the love even of husband and wife, of parent and of child. And the societies in the beginning were almost invariably *poor*. They lacked what they *should* have had. Meant to attract the young men, there was no real attraction for them. No wonder that the members were often phlegmatic, fell away from attendance at meetings, urged sometimes improvements which there were no means for supplying, and thus gradually brought disaster to the organizations. Nor need we be surprised that the societies were poor at the time. Our people were nearly all poor. They had not yet built their churches, nor their schools, nor their seminaries. They had neither money nor attention to bestow upon this new work. But lately all this has begun to change. Time has done much to bring about an improvement. Much has been accomplished also through the better social and financial standing of our people. And great have been the results brought about by the constant efforts of the

Diocesan and National Unions, of which we shall say more later on, At the present time there are in the city of New York alone fully fifty of these societies, every one of them reasonably prosperous ; some largely so. Chicago, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis, New Orleans, Newark, San Francisco, Boston, Scranton, Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Cleveland, Harrisburg, in fact all the large cities of the country are proportionally well supplied. And of these societies some have reached the very ideal of their development and prosperity. They have equipment which is absolutely complete. They possess large, beautiful houses, which it is a pleasure and an education to enter. They have libraries, gymnasiums, billiards, game-rooms, bowling-alleys, in fact everything that can delight the heart of the average young man. Their membership also is very large and constantly increasing. Societies such as these would have been an utter impossibility twenty years ago, or even ten years ago. The fact that some have come to this point of prosperity and success is an evidence that others can reach the same with time and effort. What then can we hope for the future ?

Granted the necessity and feasibility of these societies, the first thing necessary is to spread as widely as possible all the information regarding them we can gather. If, as the believers in the movement claim, and as seems to be proven, this be a work of really great importance, it should be universally recognized as such. Next we need to have a high ambition. This does not mean that we must start in every instance at the top of the ladder. The beginning may be as humble as you please, provided a number of brave, intelligent hearts be among those who commence, and the ideal be always kept in mind. As a rule, it is probably better to begin humbly and to climb upward. Very likely the ideal society would be one like this. The organization should be as large as possible in numbers. Its rules should be wide enough to admit all the Catholic young men of respectability. It should have a good-sized building, equipped with all the appurtenances of a club for social and athletic purposes. This means parlors, reading-rooms, library, gymnasium, cinder path, baths, games and billiards. No effort should be spared to make laymen of age, of wealth, and of influence take an interest and become at least honorary members. In many cases an excellent Board of Governors can be chosen from men of this class. This will give them a share in the responsibility of the work, and cause them to help it not only with the fruits of their experience, but also with material means. If you want a proof of the advantage of this portion of the plan, you have only to take a lesson from the associations for young men founded by those who are not of the Catholic faith. You can scarcely find a city of any

importance throughout the length and breadth of the land, in which these societies have not been established by non-Catholics. They have magnificent buildings, sometimes many of them in the same city. Did any one ever know a single one of these buildings to be either erected or managed by the young men themselves? To my mind the obtaining of this interest and co-operation from those who are in a position to give it, is the essential point, not of the beginning, but of the completion and the perfection of the work for the young men. One thing more is required in this ideal society. That is the Spiritual Director. I will not say that he must be a priest of piety, devotion and zeal. These qualities are supposed in every priest. But he needs to love the work, to give it great attention, to be patient, tactical, perfectly tempered. If he can be one who can delight in the company of the young men; who can learn to know them all; who is able to comfort them in their sorrows and to aid them in their difficulties, then you have the perfect Spiritual Director. Many such exist now, and are working earnestly. All can learn. And who knows but that, in the not very far future, lectures may be given to the candidates for the priesthood in our seminaries, on the ways and means of dealing with young men, just as they are given at the present time on the management and erection of both day and Sunday schools.

THE NATIONAL UNION.

The great efficient arm for the propagation and the development of this work is the Catholic Young Men's National Union. What is the National Union? It is a Congress of delegates from all the societies throughout the country, that choose to be represented, which holds a convention every year. The objects of the Union and of its conventions are simply and only to assert as loudly as possible the necessity of the societies; to make a manifest of the work done during the year in all the different localities; and to recommend the best plans that can be suggested to those who are willing to accept them. During the year the various officers and committees do all in their power for the prosecution of the plans suggested and approved at the annual gathering. Papers are issued fortnightly in all the societies, on topics that can be of interest and utility to the young men. The last convention was held in Philadelphia in October, 1891, and a glorious gathering it was. With all respect, it can be said that the Catholic Congress in Baltimore in 1889 was not more purely Catholic; the Congress of the United States is not more truly American. Every time one of these assemblies takes place a large number of new societies are formed, new efforts are made everywhere, and great improvement takes place in the associations that already exist. But the Union

wants all the strength it can get. It needs the societies which are prosperous, that they may teach the others. It needs these that are still struggling, that they may learn from the triumphs of their brethren. One hundred and fifty societies were represented at Philadelphia last year. That number should be at least doubled by the time of the next convention, at Albany, in the fall of '92, and this doubled again by the time the World's Fair shall have come. Why is this strength needed? That all may have the results of the widest experience, through the friction of brains and the interchange of opinions. That there may be many to do the work, and that reasonable financial means may be provided for its carrying out. For example, the National Union should have a monthly newspaper not interfering in any way with the work or the privileges of the other most estimable Catholic journals already in existence, but devoted entirely to the interests of the young men's movement. It should have many able writers, and a first-class editor. But any one can see that until such a time as the Union becomes very widespread and is certain of support in the most experienced, influential quarters, such an enterprise as this cannot have great success.

DIOCESAN UNIONS.

Another great help to the Societies, and indeed, the chief means whereby the work of the National Union can be properly carried out, is the establishment of local Unions of Societies in each diocese. Their foundation and management are very simple. Each society elects five delegates. These meet and draw up a constitution. This constitution provides for the officers, the time of meeting, the business to be transacted at the meetings and the means whereby the Union shall seek to increase the number and the prosperity of the societies. The bishop names the president. This officer can be either priest or layman as may be judged the more advisable. Soon a convention of all the young men belonging to the different societies is held. Next, contests of different kinds are instituted, first in athletics, and later on in intellectual matters as well. Recommendations of the National Union are ratified and urged. The meetings of the Diocesan Union are held every month. The greatest stress should be laid upon regular attendance. And the most important point of all is to secure the presence of the Spiritual Directors.

HOW TO INSTITUTE SOCIETIES.

Nothing has been said thus far, about the first establishment of the parochial societies. This also is very simple. The plan here proposed is only one of many, equally efficacious. The pas-

tor announces his intention to form such an organization, some Sunday, at all the Masses. He explains the importance of the work and its productiveness. He urges the young men to attend the first meeting, the date of which he designates. And he asks the parents to push to attendance those who might naturally be inclined to stay away. A meeting is held, officers elected and a Constitution framed. Any one who might feel at sea regarding the form the Constitution should take can at once obtain a copy of an excellent model Constitution by writing to Mr. Charles A. Webber, Secretary, 66 Court Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. A small house is hired, to begin with, or if a whole house cannot be obtained, a certain portion of one. Practical Catholicity is made the essential point for membership. Soon the tastes of the young men begin to manifest themselves. Some take a fancy to athletics, others to reading and literary work, others again to quiet games of different kinds. Materials to suit all these tastes can gradually be introduced. Should the taste be too extravagant or of too peculiar a nature for the whole society to bear the burden, clubs can be formed among such members as desire to follow a particular line and they can bear their own expenses on this point. For example, in the most prosperous society in the city of New York, there are a boating club, a chess club, and a base-ball club, each one having freedom of action and government in itself. Each is, nevertheless, a portion of the general society, and disturbs in no way those whose tastes do not run in these directions. Literary work should be *encouraged* very much, but rarely compelled. Intoxicating drink, it seems, in every shape and form, should always be excluded. Games of all kinds can be permitted, except those whose principal pleasure comes from gambling, or which have the tendency to so engross the attention of people as to keep them up late at night.

This is all that need be said upon the subject. It is a great work, and one that has come to stay. It is certain to have a very great extension and development. It may reach a strength far beyond what we now even dare to dream. In presenting these few suggestions, the writer is keenly alive to the fact that they are both crude and imperfect. Some years ago he had the pleasure of visiting one of the largest and most important cotton mills in New England. Thousands of hands were busy with the work. Thousands of looms were in operation, producing cloth enough, one would think, to clothe the world. A person in the party asked him the question, "Who invented these looms?" And with the question came up a vision of thousands of talented brains, each of which had contributed its quota of improvement to these looms and then died unknown, like the insects who give first their labor and next their bones to form our famous coral reefs. No

man invented these looms. Thousands of *men* had part in their invention. So will it be with our Young Men's Societies. We will do our share. Others will come after us doing more and better work. But this much is sure, that if a great many become now interested; if our bishops and our pastors and our laymen of distinction will take this work deeply to heart; if they are willing to add something to the burden they are already bearing, there can be no question that in our own generation we will see an extension and an improvement on this point which will not only give us the finest set of Catholic young men the world has ever seen, but perhaps enable us to build up the Church so strongly that we will be able to avoid the disasters she has met with in other centuries and in other climes.

The essential points are first, to believe in the work; second, to have a high ambition regarding it; third, to aid your home organization in every way you can; fourth, to encourage, to assist and to join the National and the Diocesan Unions.

MICHAEL J. LAVALLE.

NEW FORMS OF OLD ERRORS.

TRUTH and error are both subject to development. The difference is, that truth is always consistent with itself, whereas error is naturally self-contradictory. For example: Protestant development is only a multiplying of changes, each of which is the negation of some previous one, or destined to be negated by some successor. Since Bossuet wrote his "Variations," there have been more new protestantisms born into the world than there could be pulpits for the fulmination of their oddities. Take the last forty years; think of Great Britain only; trace what may be called the genera of the plant Heresy through their infinitely multiplying, crossing, commingling species; if Bossuet could have compressed them into a last chapter, his work would have been at least twice as wonderful. But not only the species, even the genera of the plant Heresy have multiplied seven fold since Bossuet's day. New principles, new ambitions, new methods of reasoning have come into fashion in the last half century. The later issues of Protestantism have been bewildering to all Christians, from their conflict both with one another and with their own selves. They seem to defy both analysis and correlation. They are like the four winds trying to blow together from the same quarter.

How shall we attempt to state these later issues in correct form? It is useless to write discursively on such novelties; the point is, what have been their principles, their postulates, assuming by courtesy that they could be said to have any? Thus, may it be permissible to say of Ritualism, that it is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the combination of authority with private judgment? It may be objected by the Ritualists that this is really to beg the question, whether the *reductio ad absurdum* has been reached. Let us say, then, that the Ritualist principle was to combine two contradictories, while the postulate was that the combination would be practicable; the issue being that experience has proved the fatuity of an experiment, which, at the first, was thought to propose a legitimate compromise. Yet this again will be called a loose statement by the Ritualists. They will reply to us that they did not combine two contradictories; all that they did was to shift authority on to the first few general councils, and to leave each man to adopt his "reading" of their teaching. Let this be so; and we have still to ask them, on whose authority they determine that one council was more authoritative than another council; that the Council of Jerusalem had more authority than that

of Trent, or that of Ephesus than of the very last Vatican Council? Correct form would demand that, on the elementary question of authority, there should be laid down such perfectly definite essentials, that any child, learning his catechism, should be able to see, as the wisest doctor, why this council was infallible, that not. No such accuracy could be gravely attempted by any Ritualist. The most that could be hazarded would be that the Church *was* infallible, but from causes external or internal became fallible; and that therefore the only safe way was to distrust all living authority and to fall back on church authority before it died. We should, of course, have to reply to such an hypothesis: How was it possible that a divine authority could die? Who had power to kill the divine commission to the Church? Or, who possessed that personal, that novel gift of infallibility, which enabled him to affirm that, say, on the 25th day of March, in the year of our Lord 524, at exactly three and a quarter minutes past four in the afternoon, infallibility was suddenly transferred from the Catholic Church to some authority whom it might not be discreet to venture to name, but who, as we all know, in moments of candor, could be none other than each man's own self, the sovereign interpreter of both the Church and the Bible? No: definition is quite impossible to all Protestants. For, as with the Ritualists, so with Dry Churchmen or Slow Churchmen (to adopt the divisions given by Mr. Conybeare in the *Edinburgh Review*), with Low Churchmen or Broad Churchmen, with Anglican or Associationist clergymen, there is the confessed inability to define their positions in such terms as could convey a fixed meaning to all the world. So that when we attempt to write on Protestant development, we have to face the initial difficulty: "How is it possible to define the new forms of old errors?" a task from which we at once shrink in despair, since no Protestant will so much as hear of definition. "General description" is as much as we can safely dare to attempt; and even here, as Cardinal Newman said, "generalities are apt to be unjust to individuals." Still, a few facts as to Protestant development in the last forty years may be enumerated with fair justice to all concerned.

Let the inquiry be confined to Great Britain; an ample field for all experiments in Protestantism. To appreciate the novelties we must remember the antiquities, and the course of events which has led up to present thinkings. Broadly, may it be said that the last forty years have been a test-time, and that we are now witnessing the results of the experiments. But how came it that any experiments could be needed? Nearly three hundred years had tested Protestantism, before any one of the (three) new experiments was essayed; first, the experiment of combining Catho-

licity with Protestantism; next, the experiment of ousting Protestantism from the Church of England; and, thirdly, the experiment of ousting both Protestantism and Catholic communion from the idea, though not from the life, of the new religion. That "idea" may perhaps be sketched, historically, in the following way: Puseyism was the beginning, and a profoundly earnest beginning, of what may be called, and with some exactness, "the combination theory." A certain amount of Protestantism, with a certain amount of Catholicity, were to be mixed in very carefully weighed proportions. Dr. Pusey was the great man for holding the scales. But the theory was soon proved to be unworkable, and it was decided that the element, Protestantism, must go. Now came the tussle, how to naturalize Catholicity in an institution which was out of communion with the Roman Church. Protestantism had been abandoned, as a back-bone; Catholicity was found impracticable in any sense that could be more real than that of appropriating a few selected Roman doctrines; the Roman Church, and also the Greek schism, disowned fellowship; what was to be done to keep up the fiction of Catholicity in a church which seemed to have no ancestors and no relations? "We *won't* submit to the Roman Church," said the Ritualists; "we *can't* submit to the Greek Church, which does not want us; we have disowned our Protestant ancestry and the Reformers, as being all in the wrong in a dozen senses, a dozen grooves; here we are, positively alone in our insularity, yet confident of our being the typically right thing. Only one chance remains to us, which is to condemn the Roman Church as being out of communion with the Anglican idea—the only pure idea; and though, in fact, we shall be neither Protestant nor Catholic, still in idea we shall be *the* Catholic Church."

So the Roman Church was once more ostracised from Anglican sympathies, by the very men who had but just ostracised "the Protestant religion;" the school of Dr. Littledale being as Protestant in disposition as was the school of John Knox or Martin Luther. Thus the "idea"—we should never dream of saying the reality, for the majority of Anglicans have been much too earnest to believe in nonsense—of the latest development of extreme High Churchism in Great Britain was to oust both Catholic communion and Protestantism from the now resuscitated "Early Anglican Church"; a delusive theory being thus substituted for a national loss; a fictitious idea being put in the place of historic truth. Happily non-Catholics are always and everywhere inconsistent, so that the new theorists have been in heart quite a different sort of believers to what their text-books would have led outsiders to suppose.

The other two great parties in the Establishment, the Broad-Churchmen and the old fashioned Low-Churchmen, have also been

developing new "ideas." Broad-Churchmen have taken skepticism within their range, not as an evil to be professed, but to be condoned; while many Low-Churchmen have ingrafted religious liberalism upon their old faith, in a sort of kindly, gentlemanly spirit of magnanimity. The points of contact between Broad-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen are, in these days, almost too fine to be discerned. In England, a Broad-Churchman is a man who affects "scientism," and also a calm and speculative estimate of things in general, together with an amiable impression that Christianity is a good religion, provided you care more for its morals than for its dogmas. He is perhaps a free-thinker first, and a Christian afterwards, though education and the national sentiment preserve his "faith." Forty years ago, he was an easy-thinking Christian, who objected only to Roman Catholicism and to skepticism; to-day, he will include both extremes in his forgiveness, provided there be no aggressiveness nor bigotry. In consistency, every Anglican should be a Broad-Churchman, because the principle of private judgment approves breadth. Indeed, forty years ago, most Churchmen were Broad-Churchmen. But the old form of Anglican breadth meant no more than a comprehending of all the Anglican schools of thought in "Christian charity"; the generously believing that the one thing needful was to be a Protestant, though as to the particular groove or leaning, it did not matter. The new form of breadth goes outside Protestantism. Indeed, it would be impossible to limit the range of its cold embrace. And the explanation of the great change is as follows: It must be remembered that the Broad-Churchman of forty years ago was innocent of three experiences of the present time. First, Ritualism, or the principle of Church authority, had not been worked out to its ultimate right or wrong; next, Biblical criticism, with its ally "infidel science" (perhaps a conjunction of words not more inaccurate than "scientific infidelity," which sounds not unlike "rational imbecility," or "divinely assured atheism," or any other odd compound of contradictories), had not been patronized by newspapers, or gently treated by philosophers, who made use of them as a pretext for infidelity; and thirdly, the visible action of the Catholic Church in England was scarcely begun, still less conspicuously dominant throughout the country. These three "experiences" now cause the Broad-Churchman to adopt attitudes which never even so much as occurred to him forty years ago. He sees that Ritualism is but the grave toy of earnest speculators; he sees that the Old Testament, perhaps the New—on which, formerly, he pinned his whole faith—are subjected to criticisms which deeply disturb his old confidence; while, in the exact proportion in which he resists the Catholic claims, he is thrown back upon himself for

all his religion. Thus, his "new form" is much worse than his "old form," for while he knows that he cannot be taught safely by the Church of England, and while he is a good deal shaken by the new onslaught on his old evidences, he is driven back upon his own self, by refusing to "hear the Church," which, forty years ago, only spoke to him from foreign countries.

If the Broad-Churchman be broader, is the Protestant churchman more protesting; does he repudiate "Roman corruptions" more assiduously? Now, here we have a difficult question to answer. The "new form" is necessarily quite distinct from the "old form." The old form (with Low-Churchmen) was the protesting against a religion which was grossly travestied by all Protestant authors and clergymen; the new form is the protesting against a religion which has been sufficiently explained by living compatriots and distinguished converts. The old form was the protesting only against "Romanism"—a slang word which did duty for the Catholic religion, for all that was supposed to be either its history or its teaching; the new form is the protesting equally against the new religions *within* the Establishment, and that One Religion which has been unchanged since the day of Pentecost. The old form was based on the assumption that the Bible was delivered, printed and bound, to the clergy and laity of the first century of the Christian Church, but was subsequently locked up in an iron safe by wicked Papists, until Martin Luther got the key and astonished the world; the new form is based on the assumption that, though there could be no such thing as a printed Bible for fifteen centuries, and, consequently, there could be no such thing as "keeping the Bible back from the people," still, the Catholic Church had not the guidance of the Holy Spirit—as every Protestant has had since the blessed Reformation—to rightly interpret the Sacred Manuscripts. Obviously, these three changes of the Protestant attitude must suffice to establish a "new form." The old form was (1) ignorance of Catholic truth; (2) a sort of universality of hatred of Popery by *all* Protestants; and (3) a firm belief that a Bible, which took a man's whole life to copy, *ought* to have been in the possession of every Christian, but was not because Catholic priests would not allow it. The new form, on the contrary (1) has to coexist with an adequate knowledge of Catholic history, tradition, doctrine, devotion; (2) has to co-exist with the "rank Popery" of half its disciples within the citadel of its own stoutest anti-Catholicism; and (3) has to confess that learned converts, scores of clergy, saintly laymen, now interpret the Protestant Bible in the Roman Catholic sense, while the "Protestant" persists in interpreting it for himself.

Naturally this new form has given birth to modes of attack

which, under the old form, would have had no reason of being. We will first speak of the mode of attack by "Associations." Now the chief of these is called "The Church Association," which was founded twenty-six years ago, as "the last bulwark against Rome within the Church of England," and of which the "Prospectus" stated that it was initiated because the Society of the Holy Cross, the English Church Union, and other Ritualistic societies have been working secretly for upwards of twenty years to introduce into our church and country the Romish Mass and auricular confession." This institution (it will be needless to name others of a similar purpose) has been making war on its brother Anglicans for a quarter of a century, and is now, perhaps, more pugnacious than it has ever been. To give an idea of its "work," it boasted only a few weeks ago, that "under the advice of its lawyer, the Council instituted a second suit, in order to bring before the House of Lords the evidence that idolatrous worship had, *in fact*, been publicly paid before the graven images set up in St. Paul's Cathedral." Now, the comicality of accusing the amiable and accomplished clergymen who conduct the services in the metropolitan Cathedral of Anglicanism, of "*in fact* committing idolatry before graven images" is only equalled by the sectarian pique which such an accusation must demonstrate, or by the sense of failure which such Protestant slanders must imply. Here we have a Protestant association, which not only says that the better part of the Anglican clergy have gone back to Catholic belief, Catholic worship, but have receded even into the paganism of the pre-Christian era to the extent of worshiping stocks and stones in place of God. What a plain proof that there must be a new form of Protestantism, which has absolutely nothing in common with the old form! But take the Anglican Associations of the *new* form, and see whether they do not justify the assertion that there are now two exactly opposite Protestantisms within one Church. The "Society of the Holy Cross," a High Church society, is so bent on a return to the old paths, that it would "pray for union with the Roman Church, so as to put an end to the grievous scandal of divisions." The "English Church Union" would work chiefly "for the restoration of the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood." While other High Church associations would make "the reunion of Christendom to be the first prayerful longing for all Catholic souls"; or would regard "the full teaching of Catholic doctrine as the prime requisite." Now, it must be obvious that the aspiration of the High Church societies is much more Christian than is the dull bitterness of their opponents; still, *both* are aspirations of English Churchmen, *both* are permitted to have their way within the Establishment. But the point which we must now insist on as being so instructive as to

"new form," is, that the Low Church (not the High Church) leagues, unions, associations are meant to be substitutes for the living authority of Church-of-Englandism; they are not put forward as auxiliary to episcopal authority (indeed, the bishops have not formally sanctioned any one of them), but as assuming to teach bishops and priests what pure Anglicanism is or ought to be, and so to enforce their Associationist views on the nation. This "new form" of Protestantism is like civil war. Within the ramparts of the Anglican Communion various regiments are privately formed, whose duty it is to dictate to the commander, the officers, and the entire army how they should act in regard to an enemy and to one another; and who are in open hostility to half the army on every point of military discipline, as much as on the science of attack or of defence. It is, perhaps, the drollest form of church-mutiny yet perpetrated. And to give a broader touch of comedy to such church-mutiny, the Church Association has recently issued a circular to the entire nation, in which it reproached both Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury for appointing too many High Church clergymen to Anglican bishoprics. Mr. Gladstone, it seems, has named fourteen, and Lord Salisbury eleven Ritualists, to be teachers of the painfully divided State Church; whereas the same statesmen have only named seven or eight Low Church clergymen to the equivocal position of spiritually fighting with their compeers. The Church Association therefore calls upon all British electors to return only Low Church representatives to the next Parliament; so that Parliament may control the Ministers, and the Ministers may control the Bishops, and the Bishops may teach in harmony with "The Association." It is needless to pursue this trifling to its grave issue, yet it was relevant to our inquiry into "new forms" to show that the modern invention of Associations is new in tactics, new in combativeness, new in schism; just as it is a new usurping of the teaching authority of the Church, which was never before supposed to rest exclusively with Associations.

Another new form which is perhaps kindred in principle, though it is much grander and graver in aspiration, is the tendency of all Protestant bodies to extend themselves by "co-operation," as a sort of homage to the unattainable virtue of "unity." We take up the newspapers day by day, and are sure to read such captivating headings as "The Church Congress," "The National Protestant Congress," "The International Conference"; the Dissenting, like the Anglican, Protestants emulating Catholic unity by such adjectives as œcumenical or universal; and their boast being that their union is Catholic, in the sense that they all happily agree to differ. The last Archbishop of Canterbury may be said to have started this novelty by convoking his Pan-Anglican Synod at Lam-

beth. And in the present year, 1891, we have had the glorification of the principle of "co-operation" by the speakers at the annual Anglican Church Congress. The Congress was held in Wales in the month of September, in the hope of attracting the Welsh Dissenters to the Church of England; an invitation to "co-operation" being warmly urged, as antecedent to closer ties of corporate unity. It may be useful to study the language of some of the speakers, as showing at least the sentiment, if not the principle, of co-operation. Thus, the late Dean of St. Asaph's told his brother dignitaries at the Congress that "Reunion, at least in the near future, was the vainest of dreams." And he added that "it was useless to talk about the sin of schism. Of course schism was a sin, when a man deliberately, for private and selfish ends, or out of pure arrogance and self-conceit, rent the unity of the Christian Church. Churchmen accepted the voice of the visible Church, as representing in the main the voice of God, but the Nonconformists honestly rejected that view. Still, he did not despair of reunion; but that state of things could not be hastened; and therefore they should turn their attention to co-operation." Such cautious phrasing, if converted into rough English, might mean, "doctrinal unity among Protestants is impossible, whether inside or outside the State Church; still, as it would look better, and it would be more convenient, to work together for material ends, let us see if we cannot co-operate in conventional sense, just as the various cliques in a town or parish meet in a vestry-room to co-operate about coal or blankets for the poor." Another speaker at the Church Congress thought it might be "desirable to invite Dissenters to occupy the pulpits of the Church of England;" but the Archbishop of York considered this plan to be too radical; "though it might be desirable to attract Dissenters by simpler and more cheerful services in the National Church, services more after the pattern of *their own*." The Bishop of Manchester, with characteristic ambiguity, thought that Nonconformists "should remember how on the one hand the Scriptural definiteness of the formularies of the National Church had formed a pillar of strength for Christian truth in critical times, while, on the other hand, the Catholic freedom of their authorized interpretation had availed more than once to hold in touch, and ultimately to call back into Christian communion many who seemed ready to break away into open apostacy."

After this episcopal eulogium on "Catholic freedom," a Welsh clergyman, laughing to scorn all such attempts at coquetting with the four great divisions of the Welsh Dissent, declared honestly that Welsh Dissenters detested the National Church, and would co-operate heartily in any scheme for its destruction; a statement

which seems to have had some truth in it from the admitted fact that most Dissenters like quarrelling; a prominent Baptist, the Rev. Iwan Jenkyn, having read a paper a few weeks ago at a Baptists' Association, in which he said that "the various sections of Nonconformity acted towards each other like dogs fighting over a bone, although they strongly urged each other to fight Episcopalianism."

These few quotations will suffice to show that "co-operation" between Nonconformists, or co-operation between Nonconformists and English Churchmen, is almost as hopeless as is unity. Yet the point is that *some* Protestants desire *some* co-operation; and we may regard this as a new form of an old error; since the old error was that Protestant sectaries should agree to differ, not that they should think it a good thing to strive to combine. As a matter of fact the modern relations of the Church of England and Nonconformity are so different from the old relations as to be quite new; the new Anglicanism being a much wider departure from the old Anglicanism than was Nonconformity from the Anglicanism of, say, John Wesley. So that if Nonconformity is now invited to co-operate with Anglicanism, it may well reply, "with which of the Anglican churches are we to co-operate? We know what we *left* a hundred years ago, but we now see a perfectly new Church of England. Do you invite us to co-operate with the Church of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who told his clergy in a recent pastoral, 'not to make any changes in their conduct of Divine Service, unless they were assured of the practical unanimity of their people in desiring such change'; and that even if they ordinarily held services which implied a belief in Holy Mass, they should sometimes, 'especially on the first Sunday of the month,' have a Low Church form of service, 'which should meet in all ways the desire of their parishioners'; or do you invite us to co-operate with the new Church of the Ritualists, who write to their newspapers about their High Mass and their Low Mass, their Missa Cantata, their Children's Mass, and their Choral Mass, and also pretend to be Roman Catholics in everything but obedience—that one dogma which they protest against as not being primitive?" It certainly seems unreasonable to say to Nonconformists, "co-operate with your Mother Church, the Church of England"; while yet not specifying which of the Churches is referred to; whether the Church of the pliable Archbishop of Canterbury or that of the "persecuted" Bishop of Lincoln. "Co-operate among yourselves" would be a reasonable rejoinder; "and then ask us to co-operate with you." Briefly—for we must leave this point and pass on to others—what co-operation can there be between the Ritualists, who affirm, through their favorite organ

The Church Times, "the Mass should regain the position which it once occupied in the Church of England, and which it still preserves in every other branch of historic Christendom, Latin or oriental"; and (say, for example) the delegates to the International Council of Congregationalists (held last summer), one of whom said at the council, "*our* council, compared with the twenty œcumenical councils of the Roman and the fifty small councils of the Anglican Church, has loftier aims; for, we are met together, *not* to frame theological definitions, but to deal with the great pressing questions of"—housing the poor, equalizing the claims of capital and labor, and making life more moral and more honorable.

A writer in the English *Quarterly* for last October, in the course of an able and just article on "Church Progress and Church Defence," laid stress on the vast practical fruits of Anglican industries, in education, in mission-work, in domestic blessings to the poor, in social harmonies, and in material structures both for worship and for charities. Every one of these boasts was well-founded. The Church of England has done full justice to its capacities, while its lay members have done full justice to the clergy. The liberality of the lay members is sufficiently shown in the fact that within a period of a quarter of a century—1860 to 1884—the voluntary lay contributions have exceeded four hundred million dollars; reckoning only such contributions as have been made public. Energy of will and action have kept pace with the High Church growth, as well as with the collateral spread of latitudinarianism.

But our point is, what is the difference between this new energy and the energy which was almost national for three centuries? The answer is found in the very title of the article which records the luxuriant fruits of modern Anglicism—"Church Progress and Church Defence." Why defence? How many enemies has the National Church to face that it should want defending? Three in chief, which are all new within forty years: (1) The enemy of extreme Ritualism, which is leading the nation to an apprehension of the incompatibility of Anglicanism with Authority; (2) the enemy of Freethinking, which has now shot far beyond Protestant liberty, so that it assumes the liberty of saying, "I do not believe in the supernatural"; and (3) the enemy (so accounted) of Catholicity, which is now housed in almost every part of Great Britain, so that its hierarchy takes equal place with that of Anglicanism. Church defence! To fall back on our old simile, let us suppose a besieged fortress, in which the danger is from one enemy on the outside, and from two enemies who are fighting desperately on the inside. The general in command has to give two-thirds of his consideration to the question of defence against his *inside* enemies;

while, to make matters worse, one of these two enemies is on terms of parley with the "common enemy" who is on the outside of the fortress. And, unhappily, the poor general (say, the Archbishop of Canterbury) has to receive his orders from the home authorities, who are only civilians, and who forbid him to cashier or turn out of the fortress any rebel of either of the sections, who are laughing at him. "Church defence," in such a plight, comes to mean the equally defending the rights of both the belligerents, who are fighting within the fortress; together with the right of the party, Ritualism, to make terms with the common enemy—to even refuse to strike a blow, save in mere pretence. The defence, therefore, is too great a difficulty for the commander. To defend his fortress against an outside enemy would be one thing, but to defend it against two inside enemies is another thing. He must be tempted to wish that the two Anglican parties would consume each other, as the only practical solution of a "Church Defence" in which each party defends itself against the other party.

We know, of course, that church defence means, with the "State and Church party," the preventing the disestablishing of the state church; and here, again, we have a new form of an old error which will want a little formulating to make it clear. The old idea was, that Church and State were united, but only in the sense that the State aided the Church by throwing over her the mantle of its patronage; not in the sense that (1) the State controlled the Church, or that (2) the Church controlled the State by teaching it truth. In the last forty years, two new "views" have sprung up; (1) that the State ought to rule the Church on points of orthodoxy; (2) that the Church should resist enforcement by the State. The first view is maintained by those who rejoice when the Privy Council says *Placet* or *Non-placet* in a doctrinal dispute. The second view is maintained by those who rejoice in "suffering persecution" rather than yield an inch to the "vile Erastianism" of State judgments. Now, both these views have sprung out of the novelties of High Churchism; and both are, curiously enough, both right and wrong. That the State should rule the Church would be obviously wrong in a Catholic sense, because the State knows nothing whatever about orthodoxy, save only that the Catholic Church teaches it; but, as the State was the original parent of the Church of England, it is obvious that it must have parental rights of enforcing homage. So, too, that the Church should resist the ruling of the State would be right, in regard to doctrines, on the part of Catholics; but, on the part of Anglicans, one does not see how they can affect to resist the State, since they admit that Henry VIII., Queen Elizabeth, or their parliaments, played any tricks they liked with Catholic doctrines,

while repudiating Catholic authority altogether. Thus, the novelty of the modern controversy is, that both sides may be said to be right, while both sides may be also said to be wrong; the special conditions of the Church of England being so confusing of fact with theory that Church Defence means really defence of your own ideas.

The slow transition from the old forms to the new forms, would need a volume for careful tracing or elucidation. Let one example suffice, and we can conclude. In a country church in the Isle of Wight, fifty-four years ago, there was such a dominance of the "old form" of Protestant Nothingism that half the east end was given up to a communion table, and the other half to a huge pew for the lord of the manor. As soon as Puseyism came into fashion, the lord of the manor was requested to forego his right to divide the holy of holies with Almighty God; and, after six years of contention he did so. Then came open seats where for generations there had been sheep-pens; and High Church doctrines where for generations there had been Protestantism. Slowly, in the course of years, further development took place, until a new vicar, who was transcendental in his Anglicanism, carried his innovations to such extent that he was sternly rebuked for "lighting candles on the altar." Thus, in half a century, the old form of arid Protestantism—which was equally a mockery of the natural fitness of devotional ideas and of the whole supernatural structure of the Christian Church—was transformed into such an imitation of Catholic function that the son of a clergyman who had been wide-famed for his frantic Protestantism became "a martyr" to his practical experiments of the New Popery.

The question which naturally arises is, can a religion be divine which has every feature of the weakest human instability? We have touched cursorily on only a few of the prominent features, so as rather to suggest than to attempt to demonstrate their human origin. Very briefly let us sum up their value—though but suggestively.

If Protestantism had been divine, would it have expanded itself in the way of contradictories; would it not have demonstrated its divine origin by unities? We may use the plural number, unities, because there is a unity which is structural, there is a unity which is doctrinal, and there is a unity which is (as the Dean of St. Asaph's called it) co-operative. Structural unity is unknown to Protestantism; for, in England alone, the Registrar-General counts 206 sects, while, as to the Church of England, even in Lord Macaulay's time, it was "a hundred sects battling within one Church"; and, as has just been shown, the developments of the great contending divisions are in the direction of such "structural" antag-

onism, that the visible Ritualist Church, the visible Broad Church, and the visible Low Church are as distinct in their outward features, as in their purposes. As to doctrinal unity, first, the changes have been continuous, and next, their excesses have been concurrent with the continuity. While as to co-operative unity, it is as impracticable within the Establishment as it is unwished-for by the sects which are outside it.

Where, then, shall we find the evidences of a divine origin? The "new forms" give no more sign of it than did the "old forms." We said at the beginning that the Ritualists claim their new form to be the old form, not of Protestantism but of "the purest Catholicity." Let this be so; still, as such old forms would be *not* Protestant, it would be the ingrafting of what was repudiated at the Reformation into the very Church which the Reformers built for its repudiation. Oh, no, say the Ritualists, the Reformers did not build the Church of England; that Church had become terribly ill and invalided ("corrupt" is the popular adjective with all Church parties), and was only almost killed by the Protestant Reformers, in order that it might be resuscitated and rejuvenated by the Ritualists. Whence the Ritualists derived the power to work this miracle has never been stated by their great masters of apology. "New forms of old errors" was perfectly natural; but the "rebirth of old truths" which had been dead for centuries (dead as far as all positive teaching was concerned; dead as to the Holy Mass, as to Confession, as to priestly powers) is not natural in any sense which can be called Catholic. For, even assuming that divine truths could die (which they could not do), a divine authority would be required to re-deliver them; and since the so-called Church of England had proved that it was *not* divine, by tumbling into the grossest heresies and profanations, it must be obvious to common sense that so fictitious an institution could not have the power to teach itself all Catholic truth. If, being divine, it could teach itself scores of heresies, the same divinity must teach divers heresies now; or, indeed, to speak plainly, the very use and purpose of its divinity must be to confuse all truth with all error. This may be "Catholic"; but, if so, the structural, doctrinal, and co-operative unity, which we assumed to be the divine features of a divine church, must give place to their exact opposites in point of fact.

We need not glance again at the "Protestant" vagaries and Babel tongues. Enough has been said to show that *their* origin is human. While, as to Broad-Churchmen, their theory of comprehensiveness is the assertion of the non-divinity of doctrinal belief. What is left? The Salvation Army, which is the most dogmatic of all Protestantisms—for it positively forbids the introduction

of doctrinal controversy, the General pontifically ruling that there shall be no creeds—has possibly hit upon the right solution of the Protestant muddle by saying that all Protestantism must be protested against. This seems to be the only way of getting out of the embarrassment of having to protest against the whole word, past and present. General Booth has not received the intellectual homage which is his due, as being the first man to rule positively that there are *no* Christian doctrines—beyond, of course, the belief in redemption and in redeeming grace—and that therefore heresy consists in affirming that there *are* doctrines. This is an ultimate which should have been foreseen by Martin Luther, so that he might have lessened the chaos which his illogical mind helped to bequeath.

Is there no further issue for all this Protestantism? Must new forms of old errors continue to be the "Christian" development of all the churches which are outside the Catholic Church? Yes, necessarily. There can be only one of two principles in any kind of religious belief; the natural, which must be subject to fallibility; the supernatural, which is essentially infallible. No need to ask whether Protestantism can be supernatural, since it repudiates infallibility while claiming the right of personal dogmatism; in other words, limits infallibility to one's own self. Is it then only natural? Far from it. For, though its principle as to Church authority is that each man should be his own pontiff, its close neighborhood to the Catholic Church keeps it always in living sympathy with an immense deal that is divine or supernatural. As Cardinal Manning has said, most Englishmen are in heresy, but few are heretics; for the majority are only traditionally deceived by fictional history, by association, by education, or by surroundings, so that the deception is, perhaps, more sentimental than intellectual. "Canterbury" keeps up the fiction of Churchism, or Mr. Spurgeon keeps up the fiction of enthusiasm. So that new forms of old errors seem to Protestants to be little more than the changeful toilet of a sound religion which has worked well. That the Catholic Church never changes, save in that sense of divine vitality which enables her to define *old* truths from time to time in order to meet the new forms of old errors, seems to Protestants to be easily explicable, on the ground that the Catholic principle is: "A definition once promulgated is infallible." But the assurance of this Catholic principle is the assurance that the Holy Spirit necessarily guides the Church into all truth. Protestantism has repudiated that divine principle. Hence, new forms of old errors continue to be the poor substitutes for eternal truths, which may be defined, from age to age, but cannot be changed.

A. F. MARSHALL, B. A. (OXON.).

THE MOSAIC LAW IN THE LIGHT OF ETHICS.

THE legislator of the Pentateuch is concerned only with practical morality. Abstract psychological and ethical speculation is no more to be found in the Pentateuchal law than the theory of numbers in the merchant's ledger. Still the first principles of ethics: God's supreme dominion over man, the liberty of the human will, an unchangeable distinction between good and evil, and the moral imputability of every free action, are everywhere assumed as the foundation of the whole legislation. The contention of Professor Schürer that the Mosaic law destroyed the liberty of will, is as groundless as it is captious. "External constraint is of the essence of law, says Schürer,¹ freedom is of the essence of moral action." The Professor cannot strike everything commanded by law off the catalogue of moral actions. Filial love and parental affection, the religious keeping of the Sabbath, all the innumerable observances prescribed by the laws of civil and social life must in that case disappear from the list of praiseworthy actions. The freedom essential to the morality of an act, is not the freedom from external constraint, but the absence of internal necessity. The suffering of the martyr on the rack and at the stake implies greater external constraint than any Mosaic law ever placed upon its Jewish subject; still the whole world regards the martyr's patience as the greatest triumph of human freedom and of moral virtue. The Mosaic legislation, therefore, needs no ethical vindication against Dr. Schürer's imputation.

Nor is it necessary to defend the Pentateuchal law against the charge that it leads its subjects astray regarding their last end. It threatens not the loss of life everlasting, but the forfeiture of temporal prosperity; it promises not the goods of the life to come, but national earthly happiness. This has been observed by the Apostle St. Paul,² by St. Jerome,³ St. Augustine,⁴ Theodoretus,⁵

¹ *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, div. ii., v. ii, p. 93 f.

² Heb., viii., 6.

³ Dial. adv. Peleg., l. 9, t. 4, p. 2, col. 503, ed. Martinay; ep. ad Dardanum, t. 2, col. 605-609.

⁴ De Gestis Pelagii, c. 5, nn. 13-15; c. 35, n. 62; t. 10, col. 198-200, 224-225, ed. Bened. De civit. Dei xviii., 11; retract. i., 22; t. 1., col. 33, C. ed. Bened.; cont. Faust., xv., 2, t. 8, col. 272-273; ep. 140, ad Honorat., n. 5, t. 2, col. 423; de civit. Dei, x., 25; xviii., 11; t. 7, col. 295, C. D., col. 495, E. F.

⁵ In Deuter., q. 34, t. 1, p. 182, ed. Sirmond.

St. Chrysostom,¹ St. Bernard,² St. Thomas,³ Sylvius,⁴ a Lapide,⁵ Becanus,⁶ Fleury,⁷ Vigouroux,⁸ Martin,⁹ and by a number of other writers of the first rank. But the law of Moses does not on that account exhibit a low ethical standard, and much less a positive moral deficiency. The Mosaic law is a political code, the "magna charta," as it were, of the Hebrew commonwealth. The laws of Great Britain are not censured, though they do not clearly define the degree of eternal punishment due to highway robbery, or the amount of suffering in the flames of purgatory ordained for insignificant violations of duty; why, then, incriminate the civil code of the Hebrews for not using eternal reward and punishment as its sanction?

It would imply a moral defect in the Mosaic law, if it supposed the absence of a future life, or the perishable nature of the soul. But even a superficial perusal of the sacred books convinces us of the contrary. Life is to the Hebrew a pilgrimage; death is for him "a going to the fathers," "a being gathered to his people."¹⁰ Nor can it be said that these expressions imply a mere meeting of body with body in the grave. Abraham died at Hebron and was buried in the grotto in the field of Ephron, over against Mambré, while his father, Thare, had died at Haran in Syria, and his ancestors were buried in the land of the Chaldees; still Abraham was "gathered to his people."¹¹ In a similar manner was Jacob "gathered to his people," though he died in Egypt;¹² Aaron too went "to his people," though he died and was buried on Mount Hor, where to our knowledge no Israelite had been interred before that period;¹³ Moses was "gathered to his people" on Mount Nebo, across the Jordan.¹⁴ In several passages of the Mosaic code we find indications even of a retribution in the other life. Passages like Gen. v. 24, ix. 5, Num. xxiii, 10, are hardly intelligible without such a reference to future retribution. Enoch's walking with God appears to be the reward of his piety; God assures his people

¹ In Matt. Homil., x, p. 142, A.; xxxiii., al. xxxiv., p. 386, D.; xxxvi., al. xxxvii., p. 412, A. ed. Bened.

² In Cant. serm. xxx., n. 5, t. 1, col. 1380, E. ed. Mabillon.

³ Ia II^{ae}, q. 99, a. 6.

⁴ Comment in I^{am} II^{ae}, t. 2, pp. 584-586; comment. in Lev., xxxvi., 4, t. 6, p. 543, Antwerp., 1698, 6 in fol.

⁵ Comment. in Lev., xviii., 5.

⁶ Analogia Vet. Novique Testam., c. 3, q. 2, 3.

⁷ Mœurs des Israélites, n. 20.

⁸ La Bible et les Découv. Modern, t. 3, p. 170, ff., ed. Paris, 1884.

⁹ La Vie Future, pp. 96 ff.; 546 ff.

¹⁰ Gen., xv., 15; xxv., 8; Num., xxvii., 13; xxi., 2; Dt., 31, 16; Gen., xxxv., 29; xlix., 29, 33; Num., xx., 24-26; Deut., xxxii., 50.

¹¹ Gen., xxv., 8 f.

¹² Gen., xlix., 32.

¹³ Num., xx., 24.

¹⁴ Deut., xxxii., 50.

that he himself will require the blood of their lives at the hand of every man, a promise not fully accomplished in this life. Finally, why should Balaam desire to die the death of the just, unless he expected to receive after death due reward and punishment.

What Professor Schürer says against the Hebrew law regarding its exaggerated externalism, is to the point only if it be understood of the law as developed in the schools of the scribes and Pharisees.¹ The Professor is not alone in his denunciations of the Jewish law in its latter development. Jesus Christ himself incurred the hatred and the enmity of the priests, the scribes and the Pharisees on account of similar charges.² The solemn eight-fold woe which Jesus pronounced against the leaders of the Synagogue on the last Tuesday before his passion, is in great part due to the Pharisaic externalism and hypocrisy. But the Pharisaic laws can no more be ascribed to the legislation of Moses, than the regulations of our street-car system can be imputed to the framers of the American Constitution. We do not intend to vindicate the ethical worth of all the rules of the scribes and Pharisees. Most of these minute regulations concern matters that are, ethically speaking, indifferent. It is of very little consequence, as far as intrinsic morality is concerned, whether we eat with our hands washed or unwashed, whether we wear heavy or light shoes, whether we walk two or three thousand cubits on the Sabbath day; but if law and rule determine all these minutiae for a whole nation, then the interior spirit necessary to every human act will die, and a series of morally indifferent actions will replace the nation's love-begotten deeds, meritorious unto life everlasting.

The ethical vindication of the Pentateuch is still less concerned with the real or imaginary immoral practices ascribed to the Jews in the middle ages and even in these latter days of the nineteenth century. The story of Jewish usury, infanticide, blasphemy against the Blessed Sacrament, murder of Christian priests and people may be seen in Jost's "*Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Machabæer*," Depping's "*Juden im Mittelalter*," Raumer's "*Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*,"³ Hefele's "*Cardinal Ximenes*," Milman's "*History of the Jews*," les Études,⁴ Rohling's "*Talmudjude*," Desporte's "*Le Mystère du sang chez les Juifs des tous les temps*," Jab's "*le sang Chrétien dans les rites de la Synagogue moderne*," Kimon's "*La Politique Israé-*

¹ Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, div. ii., v. ii., pp. 90-125.

² Mark, vii., 1-13; Matt., xv., 1-9; xxiii., 1-39; Luk., x., 37-54; xx., 45-47; Mark, xii., 38-40.

³ 2d ed., v. p. 352.

⁴ Nov. 1889, pp. 380-405, *Civiltà Cattolica*, ser. xii., vol. ix., pp. 32 ff.; 161 ff.; 287 ff.; 420 ff.; 530 ff.; 678 ff.; vol. x., pp. 48 ff.

lite," Hamon and Bachot's "L'agonie D'une Société," Darville's "Un Monde Nouveau," Legrand's "L'âge du Papier," Jubert's "En Israel," Pascal's "La Juiverie," and in almost any of the larger histories of the Jewish people. We mention these reports without pronouncing on their historical trustworthiness. If they are false, they need no vindication; if they are true, they cannot be ascribed to the Mosaic legislation. Rabbinic fancy is as foreign to the Pentateuchal law as Pharisaic casuistry.

We shall then have to examine only those precepts, positive and negative, which are clearly contained in the Pentateuch. A large number of them need no ethical vindication, since they prescribe actions intrinsically good, and forbid actions intrinsically evil. No one will denounce the morality of the Decalogue, for instance, or call the principles of justice in question. Another part of the Pentateuchal law is guarded against the attacks of the would-be philosophic saint by the fact that it refers to matters morally indifferent. To this class belong the ceremonial law, whether it refers to sacrifices or to festal, local and personal holiness, also the law regulating the royal power, and revenue, the jurisdiction of the judges and the peculiar Jewish system of taxation, debt and property. For no principle of justice is violated, where it is understood that all land sold must return to its original owner at the jubilee, and all debts are to be released in the seventh year. But the laws which regard revenge and marriage seem at first sight to need an ethical vindication.

But before examining these laws we must consider three other points which have repeatedly formed the basis of attacks on the Pentateuch. In stating the first of these we follow Tiele.¹ Jehovah was originally a mere tribal God of the Hebrew race, or according to Wellhausen, of the house of Joseph. Other gods shared the honors of Jehovah. It was owing to the influence of the prophets that the tribal god began to occupy the first place in the Hebrew pantheon. His authority continued growing, till finally all strange gods were degraded and their altars destroyed. But even then, if we may believe the rationalistic school, the worship of Jehovah was not the worship paid to a universal god. Others² are of opinion that the Pentateuch and its law knew indeed only one God, but did not state that there is only one God. According to these authors the books of Moses tell us a great deal about the dealings of God with man, but they are very reserved in informing us concerning man's knowledge of God.

All this is based on the recent rationalistic view concerning the

¹ *Manuel de l'Histoire des Religions.*

² cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "Theism," vol. xxiii., pp. 236 ff.

origin of the Pentateuch. In the present paper we suppose the Pentateuch's authenticity, and vindicate its ethical character on the hypothesis of its Mosaic origin. Starting from this point of view, not even the hardest deniers of its divine origin will dare to maintain that polytheism is not expressly forbidden in the Mosaic law. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."¹ "He that sacrificeth to gods shall be put to death, save only to the Lord." "If any man of the children of Israel or of the strangers that dwell in Israel, give of his seed to the idol Moloch, dying let him die; the people of the land shall stone him." Nor can it be said that in all these passages only the unity of Jehovah as the national God of Israel is asserted. The God whom Israel is to worship and to love as the only Lord, is the same who is said to have created heaven and earth and who is the righteous judge of all the earth.² No other god was, therefore, acknowledged by the chosen people as having supreme authority in any part of the world beside Jehovah.

In point of fact, our opponents in the field of Pentateuchal controversy do not so much insist on the polytheism of the Mosaic law as on the polytheism preceding the promulgation of that law. According to them, the development of Hebrew monotheism, the existence of which they admit, is not owing to the work of Moses, but to the influence of the prophets. After the latter had developed the system of monotheism, there arose a number of mainly liturgical legislators who promulgated the law which is now looked upon as the law of Moses. But the name of Moses was used in the promulgation of the law, only in order to insure it a more general and willing acceptance. According to this outline of the Wellhausen theory we must admit a double spontaneous generation in the development of the Jewish religion. First, a number of monotheistic prophets arise in the midst of a polytheistic people; then a generation of liturgical legislators spring up in the midst of a non-liturgical prophetic school. And with all these unhistorical assumptions primitive Hebrew polytheism has not yet been established.³

There is a second charge against the early Hebrew religion which indirectly affects the morality of the Mosaic law. The Jehovah of the Hebrews, it is said, was adored and worshiped on the heights of mountains. He manifested his awful presence by thunder, lightning and earthquakes. No one could see his face and live. Generation was especially hateful to him, and conse-

¹ Deut. vi., 4, cf. Exod. xxii., 20; Lev. xx., 1-5; Deut. xiii.; xvii., 2-5.

² Gen. xviii., 25.

³ Cf. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les Decouv. Modern.*, iii., pp. 1-79; *Annales de Philosophie*, Nov. 1880, pp. 101 ff.

quently the first-born both of man and animal was the special object of his vengeance. Abraham is bid to sacrifice his son Isaac to Jehovah; Jephthe vows and sacrifices to Him his beloved daughter; Samuel cuts Agag to pieces at Gilgal before Jehovah; the Gibeonites ask for seven of Saul's descendants to slay them at Gibeon before Jehovah; David grants their request to appease Jehovah's anger. When after the times of Josiah no more human sacrifices were offered, the rite of circumcision remained as an everlasting memorial of the bloody nature of Jehovah's worship.

This theory, too, is based on the rationalistic system of Jewish history. The age of the prophets here, too, follows the age of savagery, and is followed by the age of liturgy. Not to repeat what has been said against this false theory, we may appeal to direct prohibitions of human sacrifices contained in the Mosaic code. "Thou shalt not do in like manner to the Lord thy God [as the nations have done to their gods]. For they have done to their gods all the abominations which the Lord abhorreth, offering their sons and daughters and burning them with fire."¹ And again: "Neither let there be found among you any one that shall expiate his son or daughter, making them to pass through the fire; or that consulteth soothsayers . . . for the Lord abhorreth all these things."² Similar passages might be multiplied; but it suffices here to notice the captious way in which the above argument of our opponents is proposed. They know well that the rite of circumcision was probably adopted from Egypt; that an angel of the Lord prevented the bloody sacrifice of Isaac; that the vow of Jephthe was a hasty inconsiderate act for which the father was exceedingly sorry; that the sacrifice of Jephthe's daughter probably implies only her enforced virginity; that Samuel's act of slaying Agag was religious, only because it had been commanded by God, but partook in nothing of the nature of a sacrifice; that finally the slaughter of the seven members of Saul's family was a common act of retaliation; still in the face of express laws forbidding human sacrifice these scanty and often explained facts are used to bolster up a theory calculated to destroy the historical character of the very facts on which it is based.

A third charge against primitive Hebrew religion must be briefly considered, since it too implies an ethical stain of the Mosaic law. Besides human sacrifices, we are told, sacred prostitution formed an essential part of the worship of primitive Israel. There were prostitutes of both sexes; the men were called "qedeshim," the women "qedeshoth." From the book of Deuteronomy

¹ Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums* Berlin, 1863 t. i., p. 277 f.

² Deut. xii., 31.

³ Deut. xviii., 10-12.

it is inferred that the income of this institution formed a regular part of the temple-revenue at Jerusalem, as it did at Byblos and at Paphos. It so happens that the very text from which this inference is drawn, expressly forbids the alleged practice. "There shall be no whore among the daughters of Israel. Thou shalt not offer the hire of a strumpet, nor the price of a dog¹ in the house of the Lord thy God, whatsoever it be thou hast vowed; because these are an abomination to the Lord thy God."² No legislator has so emphatically denounced prostitution and fornication as Moses does. While others tolerate this practice, Moses forbids it entirely. Rape of betrothed or married women was punished with death.³ One seducing an unmarried and unbetrothed woman must marry her without power of divorce; or if she refuses to marry him must pay a fine.⁴ Women proved to have been unchaste before marriage are to be stoned.⁵ A priest's daughter, if guilty of fornication, must be burned.⁶ An immodest woman must lose her hand.⁷ Illegitimate children must not enter the congregation till the tenth generation.⁸ And finally there is an express law against fornication.⁹

But Soury and the men of his school are not in the least inconvenienced by these laws. Their very existence is to them the strongest argument for the existence of the crimes which they forbid. In this way all Americans should be considered as thieves and murderers, because the laws of the United States contain stringent regulations against theft and murder. But even apart from all this, who can believe that the God, who in the Book of Genesis, destroys five cities for the abominations practised therein, should in the law, not only allow actions of a similar character, but even be worshiped by their systematic practices.

Without having entered into the details of Soury and Dunccker's system, details belonging to the field of history rather than of ethics, we have sufficiently vindicated the unblemished moral character of the Mosaic code against the imputations advanced by those writers. We must now briefly review the Mosaic law concerning revenge and marriage and we shall have done. The so-called law of retaliation or the "just talionis" reads thus: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."¹⁰ It must be noted that the law just cited refers only to the case where "men strive and hurt a woman with child so that her fruit depart from

¹ A male prostitute.² Deut. xxii., 23-27.³ Deut. 13-21.⁴ Deut. xxv., 12.⁵ Lev. xix., 29.⁶ Deut. xxiii., 17-18.⁷ Deut. xxii., 28-29.⁸ Lev. xxi., 9.⁹ Deut. xxiii., 2.¹⁰ Ex. xxi., 24-25.

her . . . and mischief follow."¹ We need not consider the question concerning the mischief supposed to follow the injury done to the woman. For the "jus talionis" is in Deuteronomy² extended to the case of a false witness, and in Leviticus³ to the case in which a man causes a blemish to his neighbor.

The law of Moses seems, therefore, to impose a cruel retaliation for any injury received. But the following considerations must be kept in mind:

1. The Israelite is forbidden to bear any grudge against the children of his people and commanded to love his neighbor as himself.⁴ In case he meets his enemy's ox or ass going astray he must bring it back to him, and he must assist when he sees the ass of him that hateth him lying under a burden.⁵ The "jus talionis" was, therefore, not a right belonging to the private citizen, but it served as a rule for the judges. As our laws are not charged with being cruel, though they prescribe capital punishment for wilful murder, so must the Mosaic law be granted the privilege of ordaining certain punishments for criminal offences without on that account incurring the charge of cruelty.

2. The "jus talionis" has its root in a simple conception of justice, and is found in the laws of many ancient nations. Aristotle ascribes it to Rhadamanthus;⁶ it is recognized in the laws of Solon,⁷ in the laws of the Twelve Tables,⁸ by the ancient Indians⁹ and by the Thurians.¹⁰ According to the rudimentary ideas of justice prevalent among the ancient Hebrews as well as among other half-civilized nations, it would have been very difficult to prevent the injured person or his avenger from having recourse to private revenge, had not their sense of justice been satisfied.

3. Besides all this, the common interpretation of the "jus talionis" did not give it a literal meaning. The sum to be paid the injured person must be as near as possible the worth in money of the power lost by the sufferer.¹¹ Jewish lawyers spoke of a five-fold compensation: *a*, the damage must be repaired; *b*, the suffering must be compensated; *c*, the worth of the work omitted on account of the injury must be paid; *d*, the medical expenses must be refunded; *e*, the outward deformity and shame must be compensated.¹²

The last point in the Mosaic law which seems to need an ethical vindication, concerns the marriage laws. We ask too

¹ *Ibid.* 22, 23.

² Lev. xxiv., 19-21.

³ Exod. xxiii., 4-5.

⁴ *Dionys. Laert.*, i., 57.

⁵ Strabo, xv., p. 710.

⁶ Cf. Mishna, *Baba Kama*, viii., 1.

⁷ Cf. Gladden, *Who wrote the Bible?* *N. Y. Independent*, Sept. 24, 1891.

⁸ xix., 19-21.

⁹ Lev. xix., 18.

¹⁰ Ethics, V., 5.

¹¹ Aullius Gellius, x., 1; Festus, see "talio."

¹² Diodor., *Sicul.* xii., 17.

much of a legislator writing 1500 years before the Christian era if we require of him to view marriage in so pure a light as we see it in the full glare of hereditary Christianity. The personal view of Moses on the nature of marriage is given in the Book of Genesis.¹ Woman is the "help-meet for man," is bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, for whom man shall leave his father and mother, and with whom he shall form one flesh. Besides, only one woman is formed for one man. Moses, therefore, considered marriage as a natural monogamy; its contract is no more rescindable than is the love between child and parent, and the adhesion between bone and flesh.

But Moses as legislator had to deal with a hard-hearted and stiff-necked race. Had the Israelite been bound to live with a wife displeasing to him, the life of the woman might have become worse than slavery and death. The people had for hundreds of years lived in a land where divorce and polygamy were a common practice. Abraham, too, had been induced by Sarai to take her hand-maid, Hagar, that she might by her obtain children.² Jacob, through the cunning of Laban, had been induced to marry two sisters.³ Abraham, again, at the request of Sarai, had cast out the bondwoman.⁴ It cannot surprise us, then to see a similar practice prevail among the Hebrew nation at the time of Moses. The Mosaic law did not attempt what would have been impossible, and would have brought on the greatest evils. Content, therefore, with restricting the practices of polygamy and divorce to the utmost, Moses endeavored to remove all that rendered them especially odious to the Hebrew wife.

The law concerning divorce is given in Deuteronomy xxiv., 1-4; "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and become another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; her former husband which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the Lord." The following points must be noticed in this law:

1. The Septuagint version and a great number of commentators read the text of the law in the following way: "If a man hath taken a wife . . . and given her a bill of divorcement; and

¹ II., 18-25.

² Gen. xxix., 21-30.

³ Gen. xvi., 1-3.

⁴ Gen. xxi., 9-21.

if she has departed out of his house and become another man's wife ; and if the latter husband hate her, the former husband” Thus Moses neither institutes nor enjoins divorce ; he only supposes its possibility in a law which directly forbids a divorced wife who had married a second time, to return to her first husband. Now the fact that divorce is thus made irreparable, insures proper reflection on the part of the husband before he asks for divorce.

2. Besides, the law of Moses does not leave divorce at the arbitrary will of the husband, so that he can send away his wife at pleasure and by mere word of mouth ; a reason must be assigned for the separation and a written document must be procured. Thus a delay necessarily intervenes and prevents hasty action, while the intervention of public authority insures the sufficiency of the reason.

3. In addition to all this, Moses withholds the right of divorce altogether where a man slanders his wife as unchaste,¹ or has seduced her before marriage.²

Thus far we have seen that Moses alleviated the existing custom of divorce so much as the uncivilized character of his people allowed such an alleviation. The same is true of the Mosaic laws regarding polygamy. Without insisting on the polygamy of Lamech, Abraham, Nahor, Esau, Jacob and others, we may at once proceed to examine the Pentateuchal laws which touch the question of polygamy. Neither polygamy nor concubinage are anywhere in the law enjoined ; both are, however, supposed as possible conditions. In Exod., xxi., 7-11, we read : “ If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed ; to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.” This law concerns a maiden who is sold by her father, while she is under age, with the understanding that when arrived at puberty, she is to become the wife of her master. We see this from the term “ maid-servant ” (amah) applied to her³ and from the difference between her condition and that of the ordinary slave.⁴ Moses makes the following enactments in her regard :

¹ Deut., xxii., 13-19.

² Cf. Judg., ix., 18.

³ Deut., xxii., 28-29.

⁴ Cf. Deut., xv., 12-17.

a. She is not to be free after six years' service or at the year of the jubilee ("she shall not go out as the men-servants do").

b. If her master has no intention of making her his wife, he is not entitled to retain her in the event of any other Israelite's being willing to purchase her for that purpose ("if she please not her master. . . .")

c. The master may assign her to his son, and in this case she must be treated as a daughter and not as a slave ("if he have betrothed her")

d. If either the master or his son, having married her, takes another wife, she must still be treated as a wife in all respects ("and if he take another wife. . . .")

e. If the master does not marry the maid, or give her to his son, or have her redeemed by another Israelite, then she is absolutely free, without waiting for the expiration of the six years or the year of jubilee ("if he do not these three things") The only regulation that bears on our question is the one which ensures to the former wife all her conjugal privileges even in the event of the husband's taking an additional wife into the family.

2. The second Mosaic law in which polygamy is indirectly concerned, is found in Deut., xxi., 15-17: "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated: and if the first-born son be hers that was hated, then it shall be when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born; but he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born" Here again, the law of Moses does not in the least approve of the existing custom of polygamy, but merely prevents an act of injustice which the polygamist may be tempted to commit.

3. In Lev., xviii., 18, we read: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life-time." Others translate this passage: "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime." If this last translation be adopted, the Mosaic law positively prohibits polygamy. But if we follow the former translation, which has all the weight of Jewish and Christian tradition in its favor, the limits of polygamy are at least narrowed, so as to prevent the most unnatural crime of conjugal jealousy between sisters.

4. Besides all this, polygamy did not excite at the time of Moses the feelings of horror felt by us. The prevalent desire of progeny prompted at times those very persons to suggest this

practice who were most injured by it according to our views. A law of monogamy would thus have been opposed not only by the Israelitic husbands, but even by the very wives. The only charge then that can be made against the Jewish law in the matter of polygamy and concubinage, is that it did not expressly forbid these practices. For it did actually forbid their effects injurious to the first wife, the first-born son and the natural love of sister to sister. We might as well incriminate the law of Moses for not prohibiting slavery and the use of intoxicating drink, as for not being more stringent in the matter of polygamy. As the uncivilized state of the Hebrew commonwealth did not allow the former, so did the Jewish hardness of heart stand in the way of the latter.

Finally, if it be asked how God could have permitted divorce and polygamy in the Mosaic law, the answers of the learned differ. With regard to divorce the various explanations may be classed under four heads: 1. Divorce was permitted in the Mosaic law as a smaller evil, in order to avoid greater sins. St. Jerome,³ Lyra,³ Denis the Carthusian,⁴ Mayronis,⁵ Sotus,⁶ Vignerius,⁷ Lopez,⁸ and several others are of this opinion; Sanchez⁹ calls it very probable.

2. Cajetan is of opinion that divorce was, under the Mosaic law, permitted neither as altogether licit, nor as entirely illicit. According to this author, God dispensed the Jews from the law of the perpetuity of marriage in such a manner as to render divorce only venially sinful. We hardly need to state that this is a singular opinion, and has never found support in theology.

3. Others tell us that divorce was permitted as licit in the ancient synagogue, God dispensing in every case from the bond of matrimony. The principal supporters of this opinion are St. Chrysostom,¹⁰ Albertus Magnus,¹¹ St. Thomas,¹² Durandus,¹³ Paludanus,¹⁴ Maioris,¹⁵ Antonius,¹⁶ Abulensis,¹⁷ Burgensis,¹⁸ Ekins,¹⁹ Petrus de Soto,²⁰ Ledesma,²¹ Veracruz,²² Borrilong,²³ Celaia,²⁴ Palacios,²⁵ Bellar-

¹ Gen., xvi., 3: xxx., 4-9; xxix., 23-28; Exod., xxi., 9-10.

² L. I., comment. in Matt. 5: 1, 3, in Matt., c. 191.

³ In Matt. 6; in Matt. 19; in Deut. 24.

⁴ 4 dist. 35, quæst. 1.

⁵ Lib. instit., c. 16, sec. 7.

⁶ 2 p. instruct. de matrim., c. 56, quæst. 3.

⁷ De matrim., I, 10, disp. 1, n. 5.

⁸ 4 dist. 33, a. 25.

⁹ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 3, a. 1, n. 7.

¹⁰ Quæst. 2.

¹¹ In c. 19, Matt. quæst. 46; quæst. 49, ad 6; quæst. 51; quæst. 61.

¹² In Matt., c. 19, addit. 2, Deut. 24, addit. 2.

¹³ Hom. 74, de sacram.

¹⁴ 2 p. 4, quæst. 69, a. 7, dub. 1.

¹⁵ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 1, a. 2, concl. 3.

¹⁶ Quæst. 3.

⁴ In Matt. 19.

⁶ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 2, a. 2.

¹⁰ Hom. 34, in Matt.

¹² I a, 2 æ, quæst. 102, a. 5, ad 3.

¹⁴ Quæst. 1, a. 2, n. 28.

¹⁶ 3, p. tit. 14, c. 10, sect. 3.

²⁰ Lect. 13, de Matrim. Diff. 2.

²² 2 p. speculi, a. 10, concl. 1.

²⁶ Disp. 3, concl. 3.

min,¹ Maldonado,² Emmanuel Sa,³ Metina,⁴ Angles Floribus,⁵ Petrus de Ledesma,⁶ Gabriel,⁷ Henriquez,⁸ and several other theologians of high standing.

4. A fourth class of authors hold both the first and the third opinion as probable. To this class belong St. Thomas,⁹ Sotus,¹⁰ Richardus,¹¹ and a few others.

Regarding the permission of polygamy in the Mosaic law, the opinions of theologians differ almost in the same manner as we have seen in the case of divorce. Aureolus,¹² Victoria,¹³ Menochius,¹⁴ Petrus Ledesma,¹⁵ are of opinion that polygamy was permitted to the Jews merely to avoid greater evils. For they think that even God could not have dispensed from the law of monogamy. On the other hand we find a class of theologians who think that God can dispense from the law of monogamy, and that he actually did so at the time of the Mosaic dispensation. St. Thomas,¹⁶ St. Bonaventure,¹⁷ Ricardus,¹⁸ Gabriel,¹⁹ Capreolus,²⁰ Durandus,²¹ Ledesma,²² Bellarmin,²³ Valentia,²⁴ and several others belong to this latter class of theologians. The reader may choose either opinion, as far as our question is concerned; for both sufficiently reconcile the sanctity of God with the practices permitted under the Mosaic law.

The will of God expressed in the divine law of the Israelites tends with an infinitely greater force towards the greatest good than the iron towards the loadstone and the flash of lightning toward its special point of attraction. Still the divine will is in its actual exercise guided by the divine wisdom. And as God "when He compassed the sea with its bounds, and set a law to the waters that they should not pass their limits, and when He balanced the foundations of the earth," duly proportioned pressure and power of resistance; so in the moral order, God is faith-

¹ I. 1, De Matrimon., c. 17, ad 14, objec.

² In Matt. 19, n. 8, quæst. 2.

³ In Matt. 19, n. 7, c. 5, n. 31.

⁴ I, 4, de sacrorum hominum continentia, contrv. 1, c. 10.

⁵ I pars de Matrim., quæst. 7, de bigamia, a. 2, Diff., 2 concl. 1.

⁶ De Matrim., quæst. 68, a. 3, concl. 1, 2.

⁷ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 1, a. 1.

⁸ I. 11, De Matrim., c. 8, n. 13.

⁹ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 2, a. 2.

¹⁰ Quæst. 3.

¹¹ A. 1, quæst. 1.

¹² Cf. Capreolus, 4 dist. 33, quæst. 1, a. 2.

¹³ Relect. de Matrim. prior pars partis primæ, n. 3.

¹⁴ De Arbitrariis, 1, 2, cent. 5, cas. 420, n. 46.

¹⁵ De Matrim., quæst. 65, a. 1., concl. 2.

¹⁶ 4 dist. 33, quæst. 1, a. 2, in corp.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, a. 1, quæst. 3.

¹⁸ Supplem. quæst. 1, a. 3, dub. 1.

¹⁹ Sot. quæst. 1, a. 2.

²⁰ D. c. 11, prop. 3 and 4.

²¹ 4 p. disp. 10, quæst. 1, punc. 3, col. 3.

¹⁸ a. 1, quæst. 2.

²⁰ Quæst. 1, a. 3.

²² 2 p., 4, quæst. 67, a. 2.

ful and will not suffer any one to be tempted above that which he is able, and will make also with temptation issue, that we may be able to bear it. The laws of the material world trace the paths of the heavenly bodies in the vast expanse of space and regulate at the same time the minutest vibrations of the tiny atom. "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands." In the same manner is the moral law a lamp to our feet and a light to our path, so that the royal prophet could truly exclaim :

"The law of the Lord is unspotted,
Converting souls;
The testimony of the Lord is faithful,
Giving wisdom to little ones.
The justices of the Lord are right,
Rejoicing hearts;
The commandment of the Lord is lightsome,
Enlightening the eyes."—Ps. xviii., 8, 9.

REV. ANTHONY MAAS, S.J.

PIUS IX. AND THE REVOLUTION.—1846–1848.

“**L**ONG Live Pope Pius the Ninth!” The close-packed crowd that swayed and pushed in the Piazza di Monte Cavallo, on the morning of June 17, 1846, shouted loud and long. Amid the boisterous cries of excited men and women, the waters of the modest fountain ceased their song. The giant Horse Tamers, masterful in gesture yesterday, seem now subdued with awe. The wall of the Quirinal opens. A white-robed figure appears on the balcony and lifting a trembling hand blesses the just and the unjust. Few of the crowd that cheered and cheered again, knew even the name of John Mary Mastai-Ferretti. He had, however, played no inconsiderable part in the Church as a Vicar Apostolic, as an Archbishop, as a Bishop and Cardinal. Loving the poor and the suffering, he had given himself to charitable work rather than to public affairs; and yet, on the second day of its meeting, the Conclave had unanimously chosen him to fill the chair of Peter. Of those in the Piazza who could see the new Pope’s intelligent features and most winning smile, the good were surely attracted to him for all time. Probably not one that saw, or knelt, or huzzaed, imagined that this same John Mary Mastai-Ferretti was to prove himself—as he did prove himself—one of the holiest and one of the greatest of the long line of holy and great Popes that have been vouchsafed to the Church and the world.

Pius IX. was in his fifty-fourth year. Of his life, thirty-eight years had been devoted wholly to the service of God. Ordained in 1818, he had been promoted to the Cardinalate in 1840. The lamb-like Pius VII. was in Bonaparte’s grip when young Mastai received the tonsure. He had been a witness of the trials of four Popes. In a revolutionary jail he had tasted the sweets of “liberty.” The tyranny of democratic “nationalism,” he had experienced in a so-called republic of the new world. Five years at Spoleto and eight years at Imola, where he bore the burden of the episcopal office, had familiarized him with the revolution and the revolutionaries. There he received an education that should have been much enlarged during the six years he passed in Rome as a member of the Sacred College.

The condition of the Papal States between 1840 and the death of Gregory XVI., has been already sketched in these pages.¹ By

¹ In the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1891, pp. 591–592.

his firmness, by his alertness, by his prudent and progressive reforms, Gregory had maintained his sovereign independence, but the conspirators had not laid down their arms. Throughout Europe they were more than ever active in devising, combining, doing, secretly, boldly, persistently, with the frankly disclosed intent of destroying both the spiritual and the temporal power of the Papacy and making themselves masters of that Rome from which "alone can modern unity go forth." Pius IX. knew the skill and the determination of these enemies of all good. There were "friends," however, whose fidelity or prudence he could measure only when they had betrayed him and his holy cause.

The welcoming huzza that went up from the Piazza di Monte Cavallo was echoed and re-echoed round the world. Pius deserved the praise of all good men. From the good among his own people, and, still more, from many that had been far from good, he deserved affection. Beginning his reign with the generous amnesty of July 16, 1846, he introduced reform after reform in the administration of the government and conceded freely liberties enjoyed under no other government in Italy, or indeed in Europe. To the press he allowed a latitude unusual in the world of fifty years ago. To the laity the greater number of the offices were committed. The municipal system was developed in the direction of home rule; the finances were carefully regulated, and the army was re-organized with a view to maintaining order in the States of the Church without foreign aid. Patriots the Popes have been always; the only patriot princes in Italy. To the rule Pius was no exception. He was most Italian of Italians, the most liberal of true liberals. The pacification, the unity, the happiness of Italy, he desired with his whole heart.

The applause of the world was partly generous, honest; partly senseless, unintelligent; partly false, deliberately, calculatingly fraudulent. With the absolutism of European politics the Pope had resolutely broken. He had gone to the people, inviting them to a new and rare freedom. His concessions compelled Piedmont, most unwillingly, to follow in his footsteps; compelled the other Italian princes to remove restrictions that were no longer wise or possible. Metternich looked upon Pius as a declared enemy. Austrian paternalism was essentially opposed to the extension of liberty among the masses; and Austria's paternalism was not exceptional in Germany. Had Pius IX. received patriotic support from the other rulers of Italy, and from the rosewater aristocrats who insisted that they were Italy and the Church as well, he would have united the Italians,—under no single king—and he would have shown the people of Italy how peaceably to acquire and to enjoy a freedom that they do not enjoy to-day.

This fact was immediately apparent to the revolutionaries. It was no less apparent to the ex-carbonaro, Charles Albert. To unify Italy was the revolutionaries' ambition—the unification of an anti-Christian socialistic mobocracy. To unify Italy was the ambition of the Sardinian king—the ambition of an ordinary Cæsar. Rome was the goal of King and revolutionist. "Perish the Papacy, and long live Italy!" was the watchword of the Revolution; and of the Sardinian, "Papacy or no Papacy, long live the King!"

The popularity of Pius IX. excited the jealousy, the fears of actual absolutism, of an expectant dynasty, and of the dictators of the republic of assassination. Mazzini was quick to sound the alarm, and Beelzebub—a most active political agent at all times and in all places—suggested means to suit the occasion. An almost incredible policy of deceit was promptly adopted, a policy pursued with that mad energy and vicious persistence which only the evil spirit can supply. Macchiavelli has long borne a bad name. One day in the Italy of the forties, and he would have re-entombed himself hurriedly, face down. A bold opposition to the Pope at this time, would have been fatal to the conspirators. Pius had won the affection of the real people by his generosity, self-sacrificing devotion to their welfare, and constant proof of honest love. The banished Carbonari who swarmed into the Papal States, who knelt at the feet of Pius, weeping, gesticulating, swearing endless gratitude and fealty, and whose only regret was that his slipper was so easy to reach,—for they would wish to bend their heads even lower down,—they could not well rise up and stab their benefactor instantly. The greater number of them were hypocrites, perjurers, and had been thoroughly trained in low cunning. From the real people, who were then, as they are to-day, Catholic; and who were in 1846 as they are in 1892, devoted to the one unselfish friend they have had, have, or will have in this world,—the Pope,—open traitors to the cause of God and humanity could hope for nothing but a reaction that would have made an end of them. God is patient, and Satan still guileful, serpent-like. The word passed around: Praise, Praise! everywhere, loudly! Lead the chorus! Lead! Lead! Audaciously Lead!

And the enemies of Christ, of virtue, of law, of peace, the perjurers, the murderers led. Mazzini boasted of his part in organizing this campaign of deliberate, monstrous lying; boasted in writing and in public speeches. The real people, the conspirators had not reached. Every criminal, as well as those who were meditating fresh crimes,¹ had joined the Carbonari before Maz-

¹ Colletta, *History of Naples*, Edinburgh, 1858, vol. ii., p. 318.

zini had reached his twelfth year. During the twenty years that the Genoese had plotted, a new crop of criminals had been gathered in; but of Mazzini and his ravings the "people" knew as little as they do to-day. Imagine the Italian laborer of this year of grace conning Mazzini's "Complete Edition of the Duties of Man," or his "Address to the Italian Working Class!" Nor was it the "people" that the revolutionaries wished to gain over. The students, the commercial class, the nobility and the clergy—to these Young Italy appealed, and among these many converts were made. Money, influence, a modicum of skeptical instruction, were forces which, supplemented by the dagger, could be used effectively to overturn the social order, and to rob the people of their rights, their desires, their hopes.

"Write and conspire, riot and conspire, stab, lie, teach falsehood and conspire!" Such had been the instructions repeated to Young Italy year after year since 1833. Now a new clause was added. From Paris in October 1846, Mazzini wrote to his Italian agents: "Take advantage of the slightest concession (by the Pope), to gather together the masses, if it be only to testify gratitude. Feasts, songs, assemblies, frequent relations established between men of all shades of opinions help to spread ideas, to make the people conscious of their force, and to render them exacting."¹ "Speak often, much and everywhere of the sufferings and needs of the people." "There are regenerating words that contain everything, and which should often be repeated to the people: Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity. These are the words the people will understand, especially if these words are contrasted with the words, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery, etc., etc."²

Throughout Italy the same disgraceful farce was played every day in every community—processions by day and by night, meetings, dinners, balls, street cries, hymns and songs, all in honor of *Pope Pius IX.* In Rome the round of demonstrations continued for more than a year. Several times a day "enthusiastic" crowds gathered in the Piazza of the Quirinal, where they sang the new Hymn of Pius IX., and cheered the Pope until he came out on the balcony and blessed them. Men carried busts of the Pope through the streets, that the people might see and know their benefactor. At the caf  s the glorification of the Pope had neither beginning nor ending. Orators were lauding him in the piazzas from early morn to midnight. At the theatres the actors halted while the audience cheered the Pope. By night the houses were illumi-

¹ *Histoire de la Revolution de Rome*, par A. Balleydier, 4   me   dition, Paris, 1854, p. 12.

² Balleydier, *loc cit.*, p. 15.

nated, and with banners flying the devoted friends of the Pope marched through the streets, candle in hand. When Pius IX. took an airing, his carriage was followed by a pack of revolutionary hirelings who saluted him with complimentary phrases. Occasionally they removed the horses, and joyfully dragged the vehicle with their more than unclean hands. Into the churches they crowded to make a pretense of devotion to the God they had foresworn, and, on great feast-days, they did not hesitate to establish relations with the masses by pressing to the chancel rail, and there, terrible to relate, receiving the holy communion, sacrilegiously.¹

By these methods many simple, well-meaning folk among all classes were wholly deceived. To witness such constant and general exhibitions of admiration for the Holy Father delighted the optimists—and they are always with us. There were nobles, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, students, encouraging the demonstrations. How beautiful it was to see this rare, this hearty "unity!" Meantime the words "Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery," were used with discretion. And by degrees the character of the speeches, processions, street cries, was altered. Even when awaiting the blessing in the Piazza, the crowd no longer hailed Pope Pius IX., but merely Pius IX. On a memorable occasion (Sept. 8, 1846), the conspirators made a bold stroke. As the Pope advanced through the flower-strewn Corso, framed in with hangings, with portraits of himself, with banners and inscriptions, he read mottoes whose significance he could not mistake: "The first year of Italian redemption: The end of tyranny: The beginning of the new era of liberty and brotherhood," and others of like intent. Three months had not passed since the Pope's election, and yet the revolutionaries were evidently the masters of the city of Rome.

Reject the gratulations of loving subjects, a prince may not who would retain their love. To repress popular manifestations of confidence could only render him odious. An optimist himself, Pius IX. had hoped that even the ill-minded would have been won over by his unselfish efforts to serve the whole people and to elevate them politically as well as materially and morally. When he discovered that he was the victim of his own simple heart and of that malicious guile which, since a fatal day in beautiful Eden, has never ceased to operate, through human souls and human hands, against the truth and peace of God, the day for repression had passed. From Rome as a centre, the whole of Italy had

¹ For details of this campaign of education see Cantu, *His. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 140; Mazzini's *Life and Writings*; *La Rivoluzione Romana* S. B. Firenze, 1850.

been organized, openly, by the Revolution. The Holy City was divided into districts. Each district had its club, fully officered. From a central directing body, the district officials took their orders. The club was only the Carbonaro lodge under a more specious form. Daily the clubs received their instructions from headquarters, and thus acted as a unit. The Romans lived a cyclonic life of "demonstrations." At a few hours' notice the clubs were prepared for a procession, a banquet, a meeting, a "popular" manifestation in favor of "reform," and, of course, for a hymn in the Piazza and a blessing from Pius IX. Not alone centres of agitation were the clubs. Their purposes were largely educational. Each club had its journal, a small, well-filled, flowing sewer of lies and immorality. The spoken subverted the written word. False principles, libels, were passed from mouth to mouth. In every important city of Italy similar clubs were formed. The aim, the methods of all were uniform; and the members acted as a unit, often "demonstrating," meeting, banqueting on the same day, and ostensibly, in commemoration of the same event or in honor of the same person.

The club journal was not the only literary venture in which the conspirators were interested. Freedom of the press they had long claimed as a right, only because they desired freely to propagate revolution, irreligion and socialism. "Young Italy," "Young Europe," were professedly socialistic bodies. All the efforts of the former were directed to the unification of Italy under a government socialist and democratic. For the democracy of the United States, Mazzini and his followers had a contempt only second in degree to that which they bore to Protestantism. Their democracy was of a more radical character, and implied a governing power with an undefined "social mission;" a national Church, supreme over the Pope; "a national capital composed of public property, the possessions of the clergy, railways and other great industrial enterprises;" a national system of education which should exclude the dogma of direct revelation. "You shall have no God but God and no interpreter of His law, but the people." The beauties of this system were not easily to be comprehended by laboring men. To youths, at the universities, to tradesmen with a smattering of Voltairianism, to clientless lawyers and doctors with large or small ambitions, the conspirators looked for a full appreciation of their noble ideals and endeavors. In order to reach these various classes, a press was established in Rome as well as in other Italian cities—a press that covertly at first and afterwards boldly, broached the vilest doctrines, the most disgraceful lies, the foulest abuse of good principles, of good men and of good institutions.

The disorderly propaganda of the Social Democracy was not the only obstacle in the way of the pacification of Italy, nor the only enemy that threatened the Temporal Power. A so-called "moderate" party, directed from Piedmont, had its agents in every city. This party was, like Mazzini's, "nationalist" and revolutionary. Mazzini's plans were definite and complete. It is probable that, even at this time, the leaders of the Piedmontese party had a plan no less definite, which they prudently kept to themselves. An Italian nation they would have, but a royalist nation. To realize the idea of nationality, the Austrians must be driven from the Italian soil. On this point royalists and Mazzinians were agreed. What the Austrian lost, the King of Piedmont should acquire. To this part of the scheme the Mazzinians made no objection. Austria defeated, the revolutionary movement fairly started, they expected to unite the people against the princes, and to abolish kingship. When Piedmont ruled Lombardy and Venice, how should Italy be united? The royalists were not of one mind. A league of some sort would be necessary. Should the King of Piedmont, or the Pope be the head, the president of the league? Nothing was settled. The Pope had many "friends" among the royalists. They vied with the Mazzinians in sounding his praises in books, in journals, in speeches. They also advised him on all questions of Church and State, instructed him in religion and politics, and certainly warned him sufficiently against all other friends. *Veri Italiani*, the only true Italians, were these Piedmontese royalist liberals, for they were professedly liberals—liberal Catholics. Like Lammenais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, these inexperienced and not too well balanced men, of whom d'Azeglio is fairly representative, were crammed full of fine phrases about liberty. No one else knew the full and proper meaning of the word. They were the first and the only authorized expounders, the only lovers, the guardians of liberty. Religion and liberty had, unfortunately, never been harmonized, as certainly they should have been; but the "liberals" would supply the harmony. By what means? By the very same means that Mazzini would employ—by making a religion of liberty. They did not say this, because they did not see the conclusion that logically flowed from their premises. It was as true then as it is to-day that the philosophical and doctrinal miseducation of the liberty-shrieker are the prime causes of his dangerous aberration.

This Italian liberalism, like French liberalism, attracted a large body of instructed Catholics—real and nominal. In Italy the number of nominal Catholics has always been formidable. Here, in the new world, we are apt to assume that the Italians are eminently Catholic. Our assumption is probably based on the fact

that the blessed remains of St. Peter and St. Paul lie entombed in Rome, and that the successors of St. Peter rightfully rule the Church from Rome. These facts are undeniable, and yet our assumption is groundless. The Pope is always Catholic, and thanks to the Holy Spirit cannot be otherwise, but the Italians cannot claim to be a chosen people,—chosen of God. During this century instructed Italians were sadly handicapped. Every prince, North and South, was practically anti-Catholic. As long as they were absolute the princes hampered the Church in every possible way. The bishops were their creatures, chosen generally, not for those qualities which fit a priest for the episcopacy, but rather for their subservience to the person and their devotion to the policy of the ruler. The schools, the universities, were controlled by the State; and the whole atmosphere of these institutions was tainted with the noxious gases of Josephism and of a qualified Voltairianism. Nor were the seminaries much more Catholic than the universities. The standard of education was low, and the teachers were, on the average, well fitted to keep down to the standard. Naples was not the only kingdom in which the clergy, as a class, was positively anti-papal. Neither from the universities nor from the seminary could the Church hope to draw loyal, obedient, devout, intelligent support; but “liberalism” was sure of a mighty following.

Between 1830 and 1846 the “national liberals” became a power in Italy, thanks especially to the efforts of one man, Vincenzo Gioberti. “Father of the Fatherland,” are the words inscribed on the base of the statue set up in his honor in the Piazza Carignano, at Turin, his birth-place. Born in 1801, Gioberti passed more than thirty years of his life somewhat quietly. As a priest he had the reputation of a studious man in search of a mission. Had he not been hot-headed, and too much given to politics, he would not have been banished from Piedmont, as he was in 1833. In Paris and Brussels, teaching and writing, he passed the next fifteen years of his life. After the election of the new Pope, the army of knaves and of fools called Gioberti “the precursor of Pius IX.” From the end of 1845 up to the beginning of 1848, Gioberti was morally the Dictator of Italy, says Ausonio Franchi, who well knows the man and the time.¹ “Father of the Fatherland,” “Dictator of Italy,”—these are sounding titles. What manner of man was this exiled priest?

In the fourth number of Mazzini's *Giovine Italia* (1834), Gioberti, under the name of *Demofilo*, published an article on “Christianity and Democracy.” Let us make his acquaintance at

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi, Milano, 1889, p. 162.*

the age of thirty-three. "All hail to you," he writes, "the precursors of the new political law, earliest apostles of the new-born gospel . . . I predict to you the success of your undertaking, for your cause is just and pious, being the cause of the people; your cause is holy, being the cause of God . . . Your cause is eternal, and therefore more lasting than the ancient formulas given by him who said, God and our neighbor; but who now, through your voice and the voice of the country, proclaims God and the people."¹ These are the words of a revolutionary, an anti-Christian. Perhaps the writer, in time, corrected his youthful errors. If he did not, the moral dictator of Italy was a curse to the "Fatherland."

In 1834 Gioberti was a Mazzinian. He did not join the Carbonari, some say. He "accepted our leadership," writes Mazzini. Like Mazzini, ambitious, Gioberti broke away from "Young Italy" and struck out for the leadership of a party, distinct and yet not very different. The Mazzinians looked upon him as a traitor, and thus openly condemned him. Jealous of a rival, Mazzini attacked him on every convenient occasion. Their intercourse was not however, wholly interrupted. In 1847 they met in Paris. Gioberti, be it remembered, was "morally the dictator of Italy" at the time. "I know we differ on religious matters," said Gioberti to Mazzini, "but, good God! my Catholicism is so elastic you may put anything you like into it." If Gioberti used these words as Mazzini states, then we cannot doubt that, in 1847, the Turin exile was quite the same man we knew in 1834. It is possible that Mazzini forged the sentence we have quoted, but even then we cannot charge him with doing an injustice to Gioberti. From first to last what he was pleased to call his Catholicism was elastic, wonderfully elastic; and he found in it a place for everything except Catholicity. This is an assertion and a sweeping assertion; an assertion, however, that can be substantiated by an overpowering array of proof. "I would not exactly say," Manzoni did say "that Gioberti was wholly outside of the bark (of the Church); he has one foot inside, but the other foot he dangles in the water somewhat too confidently." Italians are not always polite when criticising foreigners, but of a fellow-countryman they can be considerate—witness Alessandro Manzoni. A Saxon, or even a Celt, would not have so tenderly, gracefully, lifted Gioberti's other and not too willing foot out of the water.

At Brussels Gioberti was not idle. Four years after the

¹ Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. i., pp. 312–313. In 1849 the Mazzinians republished this article under Gioberti's name. Of its authenticity there can be no doubt. See Ausonio Franchi, *loc cit.*, p. 147

² Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. v., p. 24.

"Demofilo" letter his name was often repeated among cultivated Italians. The author of the "Theory of the Supernatural" (1838) gave promise of great things. Two years later he gained a larger public through the "Introduction to the Study of Philosophy." In 1843 he published a work that made him famous, the "Primacy, Civil and Moral, of the Italians." Until Balbo popularized it, the "Primacy" attracted little notice. Then of a sudden the book was treated with a reverence much above that accorded by many "liberals" to the Bible. The "Prolegomena" appeared in 1845, the "Gesuita Moderno" in 1846, and the "Apologia" in 1848. Meantime Gioberti's dictatorship had been joyfully accepted. The school children were taught reading out of his books. In the universities he was held up as the model for Italian writers. From him a crowd of Seminarians took their theology, philosophy and politics. "Priests and friars in their sermons, bishops and cardinals in their homilies, theologians and apologists in their books, vied one with another in quoting texts from Gioberti as if he were a 'half-father' of the Church."

A theologian, a philosopher, Gioberti assumed to be; but in fact he was only a calculating, and, painful to say, an immoral politician. Among the many admirable pieces of critical work done by Ausonio Franchi, the best, perhaps, is the delicate, incisive analysis of Gioberti's mind, character, system, an analysis based on his letters as well as on his works. The warmest admirer of Gioberti could not ask for a tribute more generous than that Ausonio pays to the man who furnished the despoilers of the Papacy with the ideas and arguments that inspired and supported them during a long and a wicked campaign—and that inspire, support them now. Nor can the same admirer well refuse to accept Ausonio's severely just judgment on the man and on his work. However we shall not be wholly guided by the acute author of the "Ultima Critica," though we shall in the interest of the truth, present a fair summary of his discerning and comprehensive argument.

In 1834 Gioberti was consorting with revolutionaries, and anonymously preaching anti-Christian revolution. When next we encounter him, in 1838, he is a pretentious Catholic; orthodoxy itself, and much more Papal than the Pope. He is likewise a conservative, a monarchist, the most positive, combative supporter of princely authority. A good part of the world takes him at his own measure. During fourteen years, friends and opponents try to follow him through a tortuous, intricate maze of contradictions. When they halt, Gioberti is once more openly, vigorously preaching anti-Christian revolution.

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, pp. 156-157.

Between 1834 and 1852, had there been any change in Gioberti? Did he cease to be a revolutionary in 1838? Was he when he published the "Theory of the Supernatural," or at any time thereafter up to his death, in 1852, an orthodox Catholic, an honest supporter of the Temporal Power, an honest believer in the monarchical principle? To these questions, there is a single answer—No! And yet, toward the end of his life, when having fully disclosed his mind, men reproached him for so flatly contradicting himself, he could, as he did affirm that: "My present opinions are those I held in 1838, and in no respect vary from them."¹ Other men's opinions he had changed, leading them speciously from orthodoxy to "liberalism," and filching from them every conservative principle. He alone had been consistent. The crowd of misinformed believers and unbelievers who are occasionally or generally shocked at the narrowness of the Church, might well pause and ponder when they read that Gioberti died in her communion. It was a sad death, sudden and without warning. Friends found his cold body, kneeling on the mean bed in the poor Parisian apartment where he spent his second exile. Beside him lay the "Following of Christ" and Manzoni's "Promessi Sposi." According to report, he said Mass daily in the Church of St. Louis d'Antin. Evidently the man had a kind of faith. However, even though he exercised priestly functions to the last, no one will think of him or write of him as a priest. He lived the life of a political partisan. This was the mission to which he called himself. The love of God or of His Church did not possess his soul, control his aspirations, or direct his efforts. He had set up an idol, Italy; an idol that during his lifetime had an existence only in his own mind. This imagined Italy he worshiped. It was for him, in a certain sense, the Absolute.² And this Italy should become a reality. He, Gioberti, would be the creator. To Gioberti, his own Italy was the world. To be the creator of a world, is to satisfy a mighty ambition. Out of the chaos that Gioberti perceived, he purposed evolving an order, a harmony, a unity, pleasing to himself, and therefore modelled after the eternal archetypes.

Instantaneous creation Gioberti did not aspire to. Step by step he devised the processes by means of which his ideal Italy should be developed into the real Giobertian Italy. When all the parts of his conception had been carefully fitted together, he proceeded to action. Before men he appeared as a theologian and philosopher. In fact he was neither the one nor the other. Nor did he mean to be, except inasmuch as theology and philosophy could

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, p. 151, note.

² *Ultima Critica*, p. 153.

be made to serve his political aims. Were all his metaphysical speculations extended even through a hundred volumes, he would have had but a scant following, unless among the very few who take pleasure in transcendental abstractions; nor would he have had any influence upon the national thought and life. Take away the superlatively dialectical part of his philosophical writings, and he will be still the Gioberti that all Italy knew, loved, acclaimed as the regenerator of its civil life.¹

In the books, Gioberti's "Philosophy" is rightly dismissed as one of several illogical systems of ontology. Mazzini, curiously enough, says that "the regenerator of the civil life of Italy" as his friends called him—"started from the doctrines of Giordano Bruno,"² and the statement is probable. We know that the modern "regenerator" condemned his inglorious predecessor; and yet it is well to remember that some political philosophers have been very subtle, to use a polite word. Modesty is a fault with which no writer has charged Gioberti. He was not the only Italian philosopher, among his contemporaries, who patched up a system. "Orthodox Gnosis" was the name he sought to patent. This fine name covered an old, worn-out piece of baggage. The notion that mankind is to be served by providing it with a scientific religion, of purely human manufacture, is a worm-eaten and indeed a rotten notion. The regenerator, creator, politically, was content, with being a second-hand philosophical upholsterer. He had calculated the effect of his brand-new trimmings.

To harmonize extremes is not an easy problem. Gioberti proposed harmonizing contradictories. Evidently he was satisfied with his success. He was so consistently contradictory that, as the critic we have more than once quoted happily puts it, he can be understood only by those who can appreciate him as a man gifted with "a genius for contradiction."³

From start to finish Gioberti was a rationalist, with quasi-Catholic tendencies. His rationalism and his Catholicism were, however, mere political expedients. Theorizing, he had ever in view a practical end. About the truth of his system he was not exercised. Opportuneness was his guiding principle. Italy he saw divided among contending philosophical and political sects. How to unite them all as worshipers of his private idol, Italy, how to make a nation of "patriots"—such the problem the exile had put to himself. And the answer came: By sacrificing all other things to "Italianism," to "patriotism." Religion, philosophy, democracy, monarchism, he considered thenceforward, as means and only as

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 169.

² Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. v., p. 24.

³ *Ultima Critica*, p. 149.

means to an end, means to be used as circumstances might demand.

In order to effect his purpose, he deemed it of first importance that he should encounter no opposition from any constituted authority. Hence his glorification of Catholicity, of the Papacy, of the monarchy. The conservative elements, the religious elements of society, were captivated. "From every page, from every line of the early works, they were inspired with the love of Italy. No word of apology, invective, theory or criticism, did Gioberti write, without adding the word Italy—glorious Italy, beloved Italy, Italy that would one day be united and supremely great." Absorbing his "gnosis," readers were unconsciously Italianized; absorbing his "patriotism" they were unconsciously gnosticized. When the glowing rhetoric of the "Primacy" was poured out on the "moderates," from afar the exile could see the form of his idol concreting out of chaos. Forthwith he proceeded to give a new direction to the uncertain elements.

The Church, Catholicity, the Papacy, Gioberti had extravagantly lauded during the first creative period. Now in the "*Gesuita Moderno*" he made war on the "grenadiers of the Church." Originally, the Jesuits received their share of his opportune applause. Later in the "*Prolegomena*" he turned on them, unexpectedly, contradictorily. There is an explanation of his infamous book, the "*Modern Jesuit*." The writer, pretending to be justified in attacking a great and good Order, was in fact aiming his vulgar and impotent blows at the Church, at Catholicity, at the Papacy. Denouncing abuses that existed, opportunely, in his own false heart and soul—and there alone—he skilfully pushed forward his catholicism, his creed, his church—a rationalistic, materialistic, natural, immoral creed and church. In the hands of a well instructed man of any creed, the "*Gesuita Moderno*" will ever prove to be a defence, a eulogy of the Order, and a condemnation of the malicious, falsifying author. For in this book Gioberti exposes himself so completely that volumes of self analysis, scientifically minute, could not add to our knowledge of the man. When Mazzini connected Gioberti's name with Bruno's, he assured the conspirator did not express his whole thought. The modern Gnostic and the "philosopher of nature" were in many ways similarly gifted. They had the same voluminous, extravagant volubility, the same inordinate self-conceit, the same power of opprobrious abuse, the same spirit of self-contradiction. Gioberti libelled good women as well as good men, for he spared the Ladies of the Sacred Heart no more than he did the Jesuits,—a piece of wanton cowardice, which in a virile country would certainly not have been repaid by abject hero-worship. The author of the

"Gesuita Moderno" is not only filled with malice, jealousy, vanity; he is not only ready to tell monstrous lies, consciously, in order to serve a wicked purpose, but he is also directly and indirectly—for he was a master of indirection—traitorous to the cause of Christian faith, morals and piety. It is easy to see that, in great part, his most malignant attacks on persons, principles and institutions, are really poor defences of his own weaknesses, failings, vices. A man who goes to Ariosto for his morals, and who could speak slightly of the purity of a Stanislaus and of an Aloysius; a man who looked upon "*civil* corruption, which is the spiritual death of nations" as a greater evil than moral corruption, may appeal to some varieties of "liberal" Catholics, but will not be recognized by those who hold to sound doctrine and Catholic practice.

Under cover, in this mean and degrading fashion, Gioberti had prepared the "people" for the revelation of his whole thought. This revelation was put in writing, only after he had failed in realizing, with his own mind and hand, an important part of his well-planned scheme. Providence was generous to him, and saved him from getting possession of Rome or of the Pope, and from having a chance to put the finishing touches to his monstrous pagan idol. When he spoke the last word, he was what he was in 1834, rationalistic democratic. The sovereignty of reason and of the nation, are the only sovereignties he recognises. His Church had always been a purely Italian organization, and his Pope never more than the "first citizen in Italy," quite like Mr. Rudini's. Pretendedly, Gioberti recognized the Church as a body independent of the State. Now he proclaimed that the Church neither did nor should exist except as subordinate to the State.

Gioberti we have called a revolutionary; and he was no less a revolutionary than Mazzini. Of the two men, Gioberti was the more dangerous. He had a wit that the other lacked. He reached and influenced minds that Mazzini could not affect. Even Italy can boast of few politicians as consummately Macchiavellian as the "regenerator." Consistent, and at the same time contradictory, we have said he was. His contradictions were deliberate. They formed an essential part of his scheme. And that scheme, artful, mysterious, he pursued during the whole fourteen years of his active life. To succeed, deception was necessary. Therefore, he adopted deceptive means. Any means that would bring success were rightful means in his estimation. His conscience he had formed on a law which he entitled "the law of gradation," according to which self-constituted reformers "should move by steps and

¹ *Il Gesuita Moderno*, Lausanne, 1846, p. 302.

not by bounds, should attack neither error nor inveterate abuses openly; should never reveal the whole truth, but, in order to attain success, should expose their ideas according to the times. To render the truth accessible it is often necessary to hide a portion of it."¹ The means justify the end.

Guided by this law of his own making, all Gioberti's contradictions became consistencies, all opportune means were good. He could not be immoral because the moral was his will or fancy. Liberalism adopted his principles, which were in no whit different from Mazzini's. The theories of the revolutionaries Gioberti did not blame or condemn, on the ground of their immorality, or because they were anti-social, irreligious, anti-Christian, but solely on the ground of their inopportuneness. His "liberalism" was in fact theirs. He and they were legitimate children of the Revolution. He was doing their work, and with "gradation" gave them most substantial aid in their attack "on the Papacy, on the Church, on Christ, on God, on everything that is related to the supernatural, the spiritual, the religious."²

Mazzini appealed to the force-men, to those who wished to reach a goal by leaps and bounds; the other, made friends among those who were not sure as to what they desired, but preferred being decent under all circumstances. The two "patriots" looked to the clergy for support. Mazzini had not forgotten them when he organized Young Italy. He invited them to aid him in establishing a "good parochial system, and the suppression of clerical aristocracy." "Religion and politics are inseparable," he wrote to the priests of Italy. "Without religion political science can only create despotism or anarchy." On his followers he had long sought to impress a right notion of the power of the clergy. If the revolutionists would maturely reflect on the aim of their enterprise, and on the means by which it must be achieved, "they would learn that if liberty is to be durably founded on the earth, the decree must go forth from a sphere no human power can reach; that had they begun by seeking this sanction, had they appealed to the priests in the name of the gospel, and of Christianity expiring through the faults of those who dared not become its interpreters—they might not now count in every priest an enemy and in every church a centre of opposition and resistance."³ Mazzini's efforts were not unavailing. Too many clerics went over to him. Gioberti, as we have seen, a considerable number of them worshiped.

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 179, 182.

² *Ultima Critica*, pp. 174, 186.

³ "Thoughts Addressed to the Priests of Italy," etc., *Life and Works of Mazzini*, vol. i., p. 246.

Against the Jesuits Mazzini was less voluminously abusive than Gioberti. His instructions were brief and pointed: "The power of the clergy is personified in the Jesuits. Following the tactics of the Socialists, make the name hated in Italy." The Order was the right arm of the Church in the contest with "liberalism" and with the Revolution. The aim of the Revolution the Jesuits had not been slow to discover; the logical outcome of liberalism they had reasoned with certainty. Liberal philosophers they handled without respect to the "law of gradation." Fully equipped, courageous, devoted, they were the scouts, the sentries, as well as captains, colonels, generals of the army of Catholicism. Mazzini's vision was clear, and Gioberti's no less so. If the Church was to be deprived of her temporalities, and to be despoiled of her liberty in things spiritual, then was it highly important that the Jesuit should be driven from the battlefield. Gioberti was not a man of blood, but moral assassination he recognized as a proper, opportune means of political action.

Between 1846 and 1848 the anti-Jesuit cry gradually grew stronger and stronger. "Morte ai Gesuiti!" Not unlikely you may read the words to-day, freshly stencilled on some Italian church wall. From the press, the pulpit, the school-master's desk, the club, the Jesuit and "Jesuitism," were made hateful. Gioberti's lies were exhausted; but not so the malice of "liberal" and revolutionary. When the campaign of "education" had been perfected, the campaign of action was opened. In the streets novice and Father were vilified, stoned, chased. The houses of the Order were attacked, windows were broken, colleges sacked, altars wrecked, sacred vessels stolen or dishonored, statues smashed, pictures destroyed. Assassinations? Why ask the question? Was not the dagger "an excusable fact"—the one bright object that glittered amid the darkness which covered the land? Finally by riotous bands, by court decrees, the Jesuits were forced out of one establishment after another, one town after another, one territory after another. Charles Albert suppressed the Order in Piedmont, at the demand of the rabble. Gioberti's evil plot had not miscarried. His compatriots assailed the convents of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart as well as the houses of the Jesuits. Well might Silvio Pellico say: "Great enterprises begun with acts feeble and unjust are ill-begun."

From Rome the anti-Jesuit movement in the States of the Church was prepared and managed. Mobs violently drove the young and the old out of Fano, Ancona, Sinigaglia, Faenza, Casentino. Pius IX. as soon as he had mastered the plan of campaign was not slow in defending the Jesuits and in warning un-

¹ *Cantu, loc. cit.*, p. 173.

wary citizens. To the glorious Order he paid a deserved tribute ; but his words of praise and of warning could not stop the conspirators. Officials, soldiers, policemen—Mazzinians, Giobertians—either helped or tolerated the mob. The Pope was powerless. In Rome itself his commands, his affectionate appeals were as ineffective as if they had never been spoken. There the Jesuits were submitted to unheard of outrages. Night did not put an end to insult or to blasphemy. Candle in hand, with mock or mocking priests to lead, the ribald members of the clubs marched around the houses of the Jesuits, after sundown, singing the Miserere, and mimicking the holy office for the dead. For the sake of peace, and to save lives most valuable to mankind, the learned, pious members of the noble Order left the Holy City to whose fame they have so much added during three centuries.

“Jesuit” was a name deliberately chosen by Gioberti to represent not alone the Society, but all men who remained true to the faith of Christ and to the See of Peter. And Mazzini’s use of the word agreed wholly with Gioberti’s. Persecuting the Order first, “liberals” and revolutionists next turned their attention to monks, nuns, congregations. The fated name “Jesuit,” “Jesuitical,” was applied to religious in general. Insult and violence followed. Then giving the name a still wider extension, all honest citizens, all men of principle, all persons of devout life, were marked as “Jesuits ;” and to be marked was to be martyred—in reputation ; to be maltreated, boycotted, forced out of office however honorably attained, made a victim of, in one or many of a hundred ways. Passion once excited, and who shall fix its limit ? After the good men had been persecuted, the wicked turned one against another. And what more convenient means of reviling a rival, an adversary, a benefactor, a friend who had made his way, than to hold him up to scorn as a “Jesuit.” Every one of the rascals had his own particular “Jesuit,”—the man he would ruin. A just judgment pursued Gioberti. When, “Dictator of Italy,” he had been suddenly lifted into the Ministry of Piedmont and as suddenly deposed, the rabble hooted the disappointed, characterless, ruined politician as—a “Jesuit.” Some wrongs time corrects after a fashion.

Here and there, outside of Italy, a voice was raised in protest against the illiberal, savage treatment of scholarly, virtuous and zealous clergymen. From the narrow and prejudiced world then called Protestant, praise came rather than blame. Here, in the United States, at least one democratic, liberty-loving voice was heard, protesting in manly words against the shameful persecution of the Jesuits—the voice of Orestes A. Brownson.¹ The “patriots”

¹ See *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, April, 1846 ; July, 1847 ; July, 1848.

were the only "popular" men in Italy. And who were the "patriots?" Ausonio Franchi will tell us. He believed that being Mazzinian, anti-Catholic, he was a pure patriot; but even he was nauseated, horrified at the company in which he found himself. "Yonder man is a cheat, but a patriot," his cronies said to him; "that other is a usurer, but a patriot; and his neighbor is a thief, but a patriot; a forger, but a patriot; an assassin, but a patriot; a sodomite, but a patriot; a trafficker in justice, but a patriot—and the list is not ended."¹ Book-makers and book-reviewers there are, American, who, now and then, regenerate the old anti-Jesuit lies. Have these pretty gentlemen ever considered that, perhaps, a public opinion of considerable weight in this country knows how to qualify them, and rates them duly as no better than Italian "patriots?"

Against absolutism, "liberal," moderate and revolutionary were ostensibly arrayed. Could there be an absolutism more odious, more detestable than this despotism which brutally mastered Italy? Following the lead of Pius IX., all the princes had given proof of an honest desire to grant every reasonable demand for a modification of the existing forms of government. Peaceably, concessions could have been gained that would have made each separate people the controllers of their lives, their liberties, their happiness; but peace had no place in the plan of campaign. And strangely enough, the sole friend of peace, the Church, was always excepted when liberties were enlarged. Practically, there was not a single government in Italy. The mob ruled. To-day's concession was sure to be followed to-morrow by a new demand. Princes halted for a day and talked bigly about their rightful authority and their prerogatives. The next day they had given more than was asked of them. Charles Albert, "sword of Italy," is a fair type of these princes. By his orders the soldiers sabred and shot down men old and young, women, children, because, moved by his windy promise to fight, some fine day, for the independence of Italy, they collected in the streets and expressed their "patriotism" by singing the hymn of Pius IX. Then hurrying from Turin to Genoa, Charles presented himself to the crowd, waving a flag once captured from the Austrians. He had another ready for the priests—the flag of Gioberti.²

Naturally the mob neither respected nor feared such rulers. Governments determined on preserving order could have assured it had they throttled disorder promptly; but a constant show of weakness had made the governments weak and the revolution

¹ Ausonio Franchi, *loc. cit.*, p. 186.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., pp. 150-151.

strong. On a par with the clergy Mazzini placed the soldiery; and therefore the conspirators worked incessantly to gain converts in the army, and were notably successful. In the States of the Church—for Rome was always the objective point—the propaganda among the soldiers was most active. A goodly number of the Carbonari who had taken advantage of the Papal amnesty showed their loyalty to the Holy See by joining the army. The Pope's government forgiving all, forgot all. Old conspirators received commissions, honorable and responsible, and used their opportunities to corrupt the men serving under them. The clubs, the journals, educated the troops into a code that our State militias have not yet adopted. Of this code the first article was: The soldiery should never fire on their brothers, the "people." However, the conspirators were not satisfied with corrupting the army. They had determined to organize a powerful army at the expense of the government—an army which they could control, and which could be used, at command, against the very power that created it. On July 13, 1847, a terrible plot against the Pope was suddenly disclosed. The Jesuits, several Cardinals, the King of Naples, the Duchess of Parma, and a number of citizens of undoubted character, had conspired with Austria—thus ran the word—to fall upon the Romans, massacre them, seize the Pope, compel his abdication, and place the city under Austrian control. Names were not only stated, but details as to time and place were faithfully recorded. During two whole days and nights the city was full of frightened, noisy, thankful "patriots." Te Deums were sung in the churches—the Pope and the people had providently escaped. Sworn testimony was produced against the leaders of this vile plot. Everywhere was heard the cry: To arms! But where were the arms? How neglectful we have been! Let every man be armed hereafter; let there be a civic guard! And a civic guard there was. The mob gathered about the Quirinal, a deputation of loving citizens begged, demanded, that every able-bodied *Roman* should be enrolled and armed, so that the Pope and the people should thereafter be sure of defenders against bloody conspiracy. Pius IX., granted the mob a part of its request. A few days later, the "patriots" forced from him all they desired—"forced" is the word, for the Pope stated openly that his action in this matter was not free.

A lie, consummate lie, was the story of this plot; a lie, studied, as were all its consequences. The accused were all loyal Catholics; the accusers were knowing perjurers, and yet they went into court, and adding crime to crime, tried to convict the men whom they had libelled. The Te Deums were burlesques, the lamentations and jubilations mere acting; but the purpose of the con-

spirators was effected. At once the Civic Guard was established in every town in the Papal States. Then the clubs agitated in the other principalities and were almost as easily victorious as at Rome. The Italian mob was armed and accoutred. Each company of the Civic Guard had its quarters—a new revolutionary club.

Mazzini writes of a "species of delirium which took possession of men's minds in 1847"; and yet records the calculated methods by which this delirium was excited. The powerlessness of all the governments, and the tyranny of the patriots, are equally astounding.¹ Mazzini was never idle. His agents, his secretaries, carried his orders to his leaders, and, in special cases, assisted in putting these orders into effect. At Rome he had a number of worthy lieutenants. Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, if not the ablest of the staff, or the most vicious, was perhaps the maddest. To the Papacy he was indebted for his title and estates; and yet he had for years been one of the meanest of conspirators; a spy in the Papal palace and in the houses of the Cardinals, where his name and his dissimulated loyalty gave him admission. During the reign of Gregory XVI., it was Canino's habit to visit the Holy Father, frequently, and, at the Pope's feet, to offer a devout homage. Returning home he hatched conspiracy with all the secret enemies of the Church. Superior to Charles Bonaparte in mental qualities, in finesse, in character was Terenzio Mamiani, who philosophized and conspired, though not equally well. He was one of those re-admitted to the States of the Church by the amnesty of Pius IX. Though he declined to take the oath of loyalty after his return, Mamiani was not disturbed. Like many other Italian rationalists he claimed to be a genuine Catholic, while working with all his might to uproot religion. Smooth, cool, deep, he practised the "law of gradation" much more successfully than it was possible for the expounder of that law to do. As knavish as Cavour, his principles were just as immoral, his purpose the same. His methods, could he have controlled the circumstances, would have been similar to those of the Piedmontese politician. Pietro Sterbini was not less knavish than Mamiani, nor less mad than Canino. As early as 1831, he had been compelled to fly from Rome, with other disorderly characters whose efforts to excite a rebellion had failed. Hiding, conspiring in various Italian cities, after a time he went into France. Later he made his home in Naples, where he adopted the patriotic trade of a government spy. Under the amnesty he returned to Rome, and was at once given a place of authority on the revolutionary committee. Besides editing a scandalous sheet, the *Contemporaneo*,

¹ See *Mazzini's Life*, etc., vol. v., pp. 18, 26, 46.

Sterbini wrote popular hymns, and "spouted" revolution incessantly—in the clubs, in the streets, at banquets and meetings. He boasted of having prostituted the sacraments of the Church, with the intention of deceiving the Pope and of gaining a place of trust in the municipal government. High in the councils of the conspirators, he was an organizer as well as a declaimer, and to him were chargeable many of the demonstrations of all sorts that were so common in Rome, and elsewhere. Giuseppe Galletti—another honored leader, deserved the confidence of these three gentlemen, for his record was quite as immaculate as theirs. A Bolognese, he had been a Carbonaro in 1831. During thirteen years he promoted rebellion in the States of the Church. Though guilty of blood, again and again, he invariably escaped punishment, so skillful was he in covering his tracks. At length, in 1844, he was surprised. Letters and documents that fell into the hands of the authorities, proved him to be the prime mover in an atrocious plot. Churches and houses he would have fired. Of the ensuing commotion the criminal conspirators would then take advantage; to rob the public treasuries; to seize and imprison the cardinals, prelates, employees of the government, the clergy, nobility, land-owners, police officials and judges—excepting only such as were favorable to Young Italy; and last of all, not publicly, but in the jails, to kill their prisoners, informing the public that they had fled, or been exiled, or were secretly confined. Found guilty, Galletti was condemned to life-imprisonment. The amnesty freed him. He wept as he knelt at the Pope's feet, and swore everlasting fidelity to the Holy See. A good part of his time was spent in telling cardinals and prelates how deeply he loved the Pope. In the Piazzas he addressed the crowd, lavishing praise on Pius IX., and appealing for union and submissive obedience. After he had played his allotted part in the comedy, Galletti resumed the rôle of an audacious revolutionary. A typical "patriot!"

These men fairly represented the intellect of the Roman managers. The material force of the revolution was centered in Angelo Brunetti, better known as Ciceruacchio. An American slang word aptly portrays Ciceruacchio. He was an ideal "tough." The Carbonari conferred a cousinship on him in 1831. A powerful and passionate brute, he soon made himself boss of the rabble. Ready for anything, drunk or sober, he respected neither life nor property. As his power increased, so did his ambition. The leaders courted him; nobles were his cowardly familiars. He became an orator, the mouthpiece of the "people." Indeed he was the people—the Carbonaro, "patriot" people. His influence was not confined to the City of Rome. In the neighboring villages

he had agents through whom he controlled the riff-raff of the country, and doubtless many ignorant and many timid laborers. Terror he exercised when he deemed it needful; money and drink he used with discretion. Canino, Sterbini, Galletti, Mami-ani, were not his masters, but his political chums. Gavazzi, Bassi, Rambaldi, Arduini, dall' Ongaro, to name only a few among the recreant clergy—for the "patriot" priests had their club in the Holy City—were admirers of Brunetti as well as of the other proper Signori whose acquaintance we have made distantly; and, in their own way aided the "popular" movement against the Temporal Power.

Were the patriots satisfied with demonstrations, hymns, newspaper editorials, lies, salacious books, banquets, meetings, sacrileges? Oh yes! generally. The dagger we do not emphasize; an intermezzo, a dessert, an item, an "excusable fact." And yet it may be that the "patriotic" Italian dagger is so uncommon in our day, that we are apt to think of it as having been sheathed when Pius IX. came, full of love, of liberality, of peace to the world. "He has done great things," said Guizot, "such as had not come to the mind of any sovereign for centuries; he has voluntarily and sincerely undertaken the interior reform of his States." Revolutionary reform was based on the dagger. Persistently was it plied in the States of the Church, in Piedmont, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena. Many a "patriotic" rejoicing ended in tears. A convicted assassin was a "martyr," but a decent man's corpse was well out of the way. During the nineteenth century, the Primacy of Italy, in the use of the dagger, is unassailable.

The hopes of the Sardinian dynasty for leadership in Italy could only be realized after Austria had been whipped out of Lombardy and Venice. Hence the monarchists, moderates, Giobertians, "agitated" in the Austrian possessions and outside of them. The German name was abused, patriotically. 'Away with the German! Thei shall Italy be united.' In this agitation, the monarchists found willing helpers among the Mazzinians. After the Papacy, Austria was their greatest enemy. To acquire the coveted Rome, they could not hope until the German had been deprived of his power to assist the Pope. A war must be. Charles Albert was willing but timid. Could Austria be irritated, or the King's hand forced, the designs of the conspirators would be forwarded. A broil between Austria and the Pope, how advantageous that would be!

The agitators, in 1847, did all the Mazzinians could wish. Monarchists, moderates, liberals there were who innocently injured their own cause. Austria looked askance at Pius IX., fear-

ing that he was an ally of the nationalists. At home and abroad the conspirators had glorified him as the enemy of Austria. The German and the Jesuit they coupled together. Pius had put himself on record as to the Jesuits. The Papacy had again and again proved its independence of Austria. An enemy the Pope could not be. However his position was seriously complicated by the anti-Austrian demonstrations that were introduced into the plan of campaign. A war of extermination, the orators preached in town and village. At length Metternich, taking advantage of a clause in the Treaty of Vienna, re-enforced the garrison of Ferrara (July 16, 1847), an imprudent act, as events proved. The Mazzinians, nationalists of all shades, demanded that the Pope should declare war. Pius IX. was not moved by their clamors. He protested diplomatically against the Austrian invasion of his sovereign rights. He negotiated with France for military support, if needed. When Austria still further increased its army, the Papal legate at Ferrara formed a camp, and adopted every means necessary for defence against further aggression. Before the expiration of six months, the Austrians agreed to withdraw the larger portion of their forces, and the affair was settled by a compromise.¹

When Pius IX. was elected, the liberals claimed him as one of their own. It was said that the influences which directed the Conclave were Giobertian; and that the new Pope would be an Italian of Italians. Pius had been careful to set himself right before the world. 'He lost no opportunity to declare himself a Catholic Pope, father of all the Faithful and not alone of the Italians. Nor was he less open in announcing that he purposed' "preserving intact all the rights of the Holy See of which he had been made the depository."² His dealings with Austria made it apparent that he would not falter where the question of the Papal Sovereignty was concerned; and also that as a sovereign he did not intend to declare war against any nation in order to assist the Italian revolutionaries to form a nation. His Catholicity, thus unmistakably established, made new enemies for him in Germany as well as in Italy. Young Italy was prepared to take advantage of his difficulties. To Rome conspirators from every country hurried. A *coup* had been arranged. The city was absolutely in their power. Pius had tried to rule the mob by words, reasonable words, kindly, sympathetic words, fatherly words; but Ciceruacchio, Sterbini, Canino, had a language better suited to the men they had educated, and they acted as well as spoke. Freely,

¹ *Vicissitudes Politiques* etc, P. Van Durm, S. J., Lille, 1890, pp. 175, 177.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 139.

and under duress, the Pope had granted many demands. The conspirators determined to compel him to give them the control of his government. As it was, they forced him to change a Ministry whenever they felt in the humor for a change.

On January 1st, 1848, a mob surrounded the Quirinal, and Ciceruacchio, in behalf of the "people," was deputed to present the Pope with a written demand for immediate reforms, twenty or more: Secularization of the Ministry, abolition of the ecclesiastical courts, suppression of the regular orders, etc. The deputation was not received. During the month following, the city was in a constant condition of tumultuous disorder. On the seventh of February Cardinal Bofondi was appointed Secretary of State, replacing Ferretti. Four days later the mob demanded a new Ministry, and reiterated their former "conditions." The crisis had come, and the Pope was equal to it.

At four o'clock in the afternoon of February 11th, 1848, Pius met the chiefs of the Civic Guard, for whom he had sent, and thus he addressed them: "Conditions, gentlemen, I shall never accept from anybody. Understand it well! Never shall it be said that the Pope consented to things contrary to the laws of the Church, to the principles of religion. If ever—and pray God it may not be—an attempt be made to do violence to my will, to force my rights from me, if ever I see myself abandoned by the men I have so loved and for whom I have done everything, I shall throw myself into the arms of Providence, and Providence will not fail me."¹ The words were clear as strong. Their meaning could not be misapprehended.

This speech did not please the conspirators; nor did it arrest their contemplated movements. On the evening of the 11th, a mob took possession of the Quirinal Piazza, calling for the Pope. His blessing they hungered for. Pius came out on the balcony. Suddenly there was a cry: "No more priests in the government!" Lifting his right hand, and motioning for silence, Pius IX. addressed the multitude. "Before the benediction of Heaven descends on you, on the Roman States, and, I repeat it, on all Italy, I recommend to you union, concord, and I desire that your demands should not be contrary to the sanctity of the Holy See. Certain cries, which do not come from the heart of my people, are uttered by a small number of unknown men. I cannot, should not, will not listen to them: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio*. On the express condition, therefore, that you be faithful to the Pontiff and the Church—(Yes, yes, Holy Father we swear it!)—on this condition I pray God that he will deign to bless you, as I

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 60-61.

do with my whole soul. Remember your promise; be faithful to the Church and to the Pontiff."¹

Their promise they did not remember; but the Pope's declaration was public and final. He did not forget it. The enemies of the Papacy were forever separated from the Pope. "Patriots," nationals, liberals, moderates, from this day forth, whatever their honesty, were none the less culpable. Pontiff and Church spoke, as with one voice, the courageous: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio.*

JOHN A. MOONEY, LL.D.

CATHOLICITY IN ENGLAND FIFTY YEARS AGO—A RETROSPECT.

PART I.

WE have been given to understand that certain justly revered American Catholics wish to put on record some personal reminiscences with respect to Catholicity in England. In deference to their wishes we have written the following pages, but we have done so not unwillingly for the following reasons:

It is obvious that there must be very much resemblance and affinity between "Great and Greater" Britain and that both exercise a powerful influence on the world external to them. We have been informed and believe that the American portion of the Catholic Church has a very great future before it. Records of facts, as to Catholicity in England may be expected (on account of the resemblance and affinity above referred to) to be of use to the Catholic Church in America, and through it (on account of its great future) to have a very wide-spread utility throughout the world.

But there is one possible misunderstanding against which we wish especially to guard. It is the mistake, which might arise, that what we shall say here is meant by us to refer indirectly to some person or party, to some school or tendency of thought, or to some prevalent or exceptional practices, now existing in the American Church.

Although we take a very lively interest in all that concerns the United States and, of course, in the Church in the United States,

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 62.

we nevertheless are in complete ignorance as to any controversies which have taken place or are likely to take place within it.

Therefore the following pages are offered simply for what they may happen to be worth as a record of facts, opinions and sentiments which have existed or exist in England, without any unexpressed wish or *arrière pensée* whatsoever.

When our attention first became directed to matters ecclesiastical, we were a Protestant boy at Clapham Grammar School, the Master of which was Charles Pritchard, of late years Professor of Astronomy at Oxford. The Puseyite movement was then (1843) in full career and we formed a close friendship with the Rev. E. Wingfield, who was the curate of St. Mark's, North Audley Street, London, the church our family regularly attended. It was his sister that married the well-known Dr. Ward, who was subsequently deprived of his degree at Oxford for having published his "Ideal of a Christian Church." On account of this work he was spoken of as "Ideal Ward," the humor of the nickname consisting in its application to one whose solid and rotund figure was so eminently "real."

Mr. Wingfield was a very earnest and ascetic clergyman who, like his friend Dr. (then Mr.) Ward, held all Roman Catholic doctrine except that of full Papal Supremacy. At his house we used to meet Mr. Ward with whom we occasionally went to attend the afternoon service at Mr. Oakley's chapel, Margaret Street, then a celebrated haunt of very "high" church people. Wonderful is the difference between that shabby, little conventicle with its poor attempts and budding ceremonial, and the stately Church of All Saints, with its elaborate ritual which has long since taken its place.

Mr. Frederick Oakley was notorious and widely reprobated for preaching in his surplice and having two candles alight on his Communion Table. Years afterwards he died priest of the church at Islington and a Canon of Westminster.

Until after Newman's conversion there was very little ritual observance in the English Established Church. Vestments were indeed worn by the Rev. Bernard Smith—subsequently one of the early converts—but we never heard of another instance and his practice was no matter of public notoriety. Then, the service of the Church of England—apart from cathedrals, colleges, chapels, etc.—was almost entirely read by the clergyman and his clerk. The morning prayers were long and tedious, consisting of matins, with the litany, the first part of the Communion Service and a sermon. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was usually administered but on one Sunday in each month and on each Sunday the whole of the congregation except the communicants left before

the second part of the Communion Service began. No cross¹ stood upon any of the tables, nor did candles, even unlighted, save in very rare cases, stand upon it.

Great indeed was the contrast presented in those days between Catholic worship and that of the Protestant Church. This contrast also did not by any means consist alone in matters of ritual, but quite as much in the devout demeanor of the worshipers in our poor Catholic chapels, contrasted with that to be seen in ordinary parish churches. In the latter there was order and decorum indeed, but in the former there was the expression to a degree not then to be elsewhere met with, of a sense of God's presence and direct communion with Him.

This forcibly struck us and some of our companions, when we first began to be an occasional witness of Catholic worship—without at all understanding it.

In those days Catholics were relatively few, especially amongst the poor; the great influx of Irish not having then taken place. The Roman Catholic religion was detested, but individual Catholics were highly respected as good, scrupulous and very devout people. One hears men and women of that generation, sometimes spoken of now, as "old-fashioned Catholics who kept the Commandments."

Signs and relics of the penal days still remained amongst us. Then the best known chapels in London were still connected with foreign embassies—once a condition necessary for their very existence.

One of the most interesting was the Sardinian Chapel in Lincoln's Inn, which dates from 1648 and was sacked in the revolution of 1688. In it, about a dozen years before² our retrospect begins, a figure of our Lady was erected for the first time since the Reformation—not without much trepidation and many objections. Between 1833 and 1836 a small one was placed in a niche under the gable of the west end of a church designed for the Jesuits and built by the Gallini family, in St. John's wood—a humble imitation (in iron and plaster) of the ancient church in London of the Knights Templar. We can recall nothing of the kind elsewhere. Among the results of the long continuance of the penal laws was not only a habit of concealing all things Catholic, as much as possible from Protestant eyes and ears, but a certain distaste for external manifes-

¹ So far as we know, but we have been told that one did so at Bonchurch, in the Isle of Wight, where it had not been recently put, but had survived for many years, perhaps upwards of a hundred.

² By a priest named Bernasconi as we have been informed.

tations, not obligatory, had come to exist among even very excellent Catholics.¹

The Spanish Chapel,² which dated from 1791, was designed by Bonomi, had some pretensions to ornament, but had capacious galleries on either side, while a sort of private box with a window looking into the gospel side of the sanctuary, served for the members of the Spanish Embassy. The Bavarian Chapel, in Warwick Street, was similarly galleried and in point of decoration was plainness itself, save that for High Mass, very distinguished opera singers used to perform in the organ gallery, on which account this chapel³ used to go by the name of the "shilling opera."

The French chapel, which also dates from the end of the last century, still forms part of a row of stabling, and is an interesting relic of the past. We have been told that during the French Revolution seven eminent French prelates used to sit on a bench in its sanctuary during High Mass.

In those days the Catholics of England consisted, for the most part, of a number of highly respected families of long descent, some of whom like the Tichbornes of Tichborne and the Middletons of Middleton, were said to have remained substantially the same since the days of the heptarchy.

Such families mostly led retired lives, never having mixed with Protestants of similar social position, at school or college or in the political arena—from which law, as well as custom, had excluded them.

They often had their chaplains who said Mass in their private chapels, some of which had never been used for Protestant wor-

¹ One result of the pains and penalties to which Catholics have been so long subject for hearing, and much more for saying "Mass," was a habit at least here and there, of suppressing the use of that word. In parts of Lancashire "Mass" was spoken of as "Morning Prayers" and "Vespers" as "Afternoon Prayers."

As an example of the distaste above referred to, I can recall the case of a very pious and exemplary Catholic of Lancashire who was asked to join in a subscription for a great novelty—namely, the erection for the first time of a statue of our Lady in his chapel. He was a regular Communicant and zealous supporter of his religion. Nevertheless, his quaint reply, in his Lancashire dialect, was: "Who wants statoo? I've done very well without statoo. Confound statoo!"

² This has just ceased to be used on account of the lease having expired. Long ago, however, its side galleries and "private box" were removed, while the chapel had acquired a great number of images of various kinds. It is replaced by a large church in a very severe and simple early Gothic style, which has just been erected in its vicinity from designs of Mr. Goldie.

³ It is still in use. Unfortunately very good intentions have resulted in destroying the historical character of this old chapel without converting it into a building which any person of taste can possibly admire. Had it been left as it was in the middle of this century, it would have constituted an interesting survival of the state of things which existed amongst the English Catholics when emerging from their political disadvantages. It was one of the chapels plundered during the Lord George Gordon riots.

ship and were very old—that of Stonor, dating from A. D. 1349. That of Haslewood Castle, Yorkshire, is of the thirteenth century and that of the Eystons of East Hundred, of the fourteenth century.

Amongst such families were the Berkeleys, the Egertons, the Blounts, the Beddingfields, the Petres, the Mostyns, the Radcliffes, the Vavasours, the Constables, the De Traffords, the Lawsons, the Stricklands, the Tempests, the Cliffords, the Welds, the Arundels, the Howards, the Stourtons and Langdales, and many more. Besides these much esteemed families—who all knew each other and persistently intermarried, often (as has been supposed) to their physical detriment—there was a scanty population in a certain number of villages, with some farmers and laborers, and also a sprinkling of respectable shopkeepers, and a few professional men. There were a good many medical men, Chancery barristers and conveyancers; while a few districts in the North, notably in Lancashire, had uninterruptedly remained of the old religion.

Under these conditions, the Catholic clergy enjoyed an amount of leisure whereof the great immigration of poor from Ireland which has since taken place, has, as a rule, deprived them. Accordingly not a few learned priests gave distinction to the small flock in England and enjoyed the friendship and esteem of Protestant students devoted to similar pursuits. One of the best known was Dr. Lingard, so celebrated for his admirable history of England, but whose "*Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis*," published in 1845, is a folio work of such completeness, fulness, detail and accuracy, that no other diocese in England (probably even in the whole of Christendom) can boast of possessing its equal. Another illustrious priest was Dr. George Oliver of Exeter, and another was Dr. Rock, whose well-known work, entitled "*Hierurgia*," dates from 1833. There was also Dr. Tierney who wrote the "*History of Arundel*," and, did space permit of descriptive explanation, many more names could be here brought forward.

Thus the Catholic Church in England, half a century ago, consisted of a certain number of distinguished families, their dependants and the poor; while the middle class was barely represented, and indeed it is but very feebly represented still.

There was a scanty clergy (but 683 priests in all England and Wales in 1846) with a creditable proportion of learning-devoted men, amongst whom apostates were almost unheard of.

The country was divided into eight Districts, or Vicariates, whereof Dr. Griffiths was Vicar-Apostolic of the London District and Dr. Walsh Vicar-Apostolic of the Central District,¹ with Dr. Nicholas Wiseman as his coadjutor.

¹ This comprised the counties of Derbyshire, Leicester, Nottinghamshire, Oxford-

Only in the Central District were there any religious communities of men, even in 1846; and these consisted of Passionists, Redemptorists, Conceptionists, Dominicans, Rosminians and Cistercians, while there were but thirty-four convents of women in all England.

But though the externals of religion were for the most part simple and unobtrusive, a great movement was on foot and had already made a considerable advance. The first beginning was in the early days of the present century and it was greatly promoted by the illustrious Bishop Milner.¹ In the year of 1844, that great architect and man of distinguished genius, Augustus Welby Pugin, had been received into the Church and was hard at work diffusing a knowledge of correct principles by his incisive writings and marvellous powers of drawing; while setting an example in practice by means of the churches he designed and saw raised. John, the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, was not only a most pious Catholic, but a munificent patron and promoter of mediæval art. His country residence "Alton Towers," gave Pugin much opportunity, while in its vicinity an admirably picturesque group of buildings was being raised as a residence for a warden and assistant, six decayed priests, twelve poor laymen, a schoolmaster and a school for poor boys.

But his typical work was, as it should have been, the Church² which he erected at his own cost at Ramsgate and wherein he now lies buried. That, and a large number of other churches designed by A. W. Pugin, were, in 1844, rapidly rising in many places in England, through the exertions of a considerable number of men, cleric and lay, who were all alike animated with a zeal for the beauty of God's house and the dignity and solemnity of worship. One of the most zealous was John Hardman of Birmingham, a manufacturer who made the foundation of the most perfect specimens of mediæval metal work, a true labor of love. The admirable choir thus instituted at St. Chad's sings its solemn music to this day and is the mother of the School of Music at Ratisbon.

This development was by no means confined to England, but extended through Northern Europe—that is through France, Belgium and Germany. It was no doubt an outcome of that great reaction from the ideas and sentiments of the eighteenth century, known as Romanticism, which was so much promoted by Chatau-

shire, Shropshire, Staffordshire and Worcestershire, which together were (in 1846) reckoned to contain a population of 2,284,240 souls.

¹ His essays were published in 1810 and 1811 and it was he who built old Oscott.

² This I believe was never thoroughly completed owing to the death of the Earl and his Catholic successor, after whose decease the magnificent Chapel of Alton Towers was defaced and made a place for Protestant worship.

briand's "*Génie de Christianisme*," in France, and in England by the writings of Sir Walter Scott. Converts as yet, however, were few and far between. Amongst them there were those who must find mention here. One of these was a refined and tender-souled gentleman who was then known as Ambrose Lisle Phillips,¹ and who has but recently departed from amongst us, having been latterly known as Mr. Ambrose de Lisle. The other convert was the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, younger brother of the third and fourth Earls Spencer and son of the second. He was a man whose patience, humility,² self-denial and zeal for souls were alike admirable. After being for some years a secular priest, he joined the order of Passionists, and died in 1864. To them we shall have hereafter to refer.

In England, outside the Church, the mental atmosphere in 1844 was different indeed from what it has since become. A love of physical science was spreading, but it seemed to present no special danger for Christianity, although the geology of Lyell and others, made a few minds somewhat ill at ease. Zoology and botany certainly looked harmless enough. Darwin had just returned from his memorable voyage in the *Beagle* and was quietly resting at Down, meditating and feeling his way towards that which was not to startle the world till fifteen years afterwards. Professor Owen was promulgating, by lectures given at the College of Surgeons, his theory of the transcendental principles underlying the construction of animals—principles akin to the ideas of Oken and Goethe. These lectures were a mixture of mysticism and anatomy, attractive to many minds and amongst them to Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and subsequently to our own; for ever since we were a child we had been passionately devoted to natural history. In those days then, men's minds were not carried away from Christianity by problems of biology, nor had Biblical criticism or a critical study of the first two centuries of the Church's history, raised difficulties such as those which have had since such wide-spreading consequences. The movement of thought in England was at that time mainly in an upward direction as regards religion, struggling against the stupid Protestant conservatism of ignorant churchwardens, and of estimable and pious Evangelicals. There was certainly a great outcry against the surplice in the pulpit and against Popery and Jesuitism, but irreligion did not dare

¹ He was the first to erect a rood in England, since the Reformation.

² Once when a friend from his father's saw him take his ticket at a railway station and exclaimed "My dear Mr. Spencer, why do you go third-class?" "Because there is no fourth," he replied. On a much later occasion another friend said to him, "If you don't take care, some day you'll die in a ditch," when he answered, "What a glorious thing to die in a ditch in God's service." Such in fact, was the very death which God accorded to His loving, good and faithful servant, George Spencer.

to be openly aggressive towards Christianity. The general public were more occupied about "Free Trading" than Free-thinking, while, in the higher classes, infidelity was apologetic in tone and, being deemed "bad form," was far from common. No young man in those days could hope to make his way socially amongst fine ladies, by undisguised irreverence and profanity.

The movement towards more solemn worship and the building of churches like those which existed before the separation from Rome, was extending far and wide in the Established Church. The "Camden Society" was doing good service, and a monthly publication, entitled the "Ecclesiologist," was unsparing in its criticisms of ignorant and barbarous arrangements.

There was a manifest rivalry between High Church Anglicans and the Catholics of those days¹ as to who could build churches the more completely in harmony with the traditions of mediæval England. This rivalry it was easy to understand, and it had a reasonable and practical basis. The Anglicans desired to substantiate their claim to be the real "old Catholic Church of England," and to make out that the Catholics were but an intruding set of Italians, full of un-English ideas and sentiments, while the Catholics wished to demonstrate that they were, what they really had always been, the representatives of the Church founded by St. Augustine.

It was under these circumstances that we first came under the influence of the conflicting waves of religious controversy, which was then a struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism—not between Christianity and unbelief. For that controversy no book was ever written, which I know of, that nearly equalled Milner's "End of Controversy." Its careful perusal almost convinced us that it must be our duty to submit at once, though it was impossible not to doubt whether it could be right and reasonable for a mere youth to take so important a step, which all the great leaders of the Tractarian movement, still hung back from taking. In the mean time we were removed to King's College, London, taking up our residence in the house of Mr. Brewer, since so celebrated for his important historical labors in connection with the Record Office. He was then a Master of King's College, who in his own house always wore a cassock and he himself told us that he accepted all Roman doctrines except that of Papal supremacy.

Like many others interested in the High Church movement, we took great interest in architecture and antiquity, and in the spring of 1844, made a short tour to see some of the more celebrated

¹ The Gregorian tones were obtained, we have been told, by Newman from the English College at Rome. They were otherwise unknown in the Church of England.

recent buildings, and it was thus that we, for the first time, formed the acquaintance of a Catholic priest. Such insignificant personal matters, are, as need hardly be said, only mentioned because of their connection with one or another period of Catholic development in our country.

Birmingham was then one of the centres of religious revival and Catholic life in England; and there, not long before, had been opened one of Pugin's most memorable churches—that of St. Chad. It was a lofty structure, with very tall pillars, and the Sanctuary was enclosed with a noble rood-screen surmounted by a fine ancient rood, both of which, we believe, had been obtained in Germany. Over the Altar was a shrine enclosing what were believed to be the relics of St. Chad, which had found their way there somewhat mysteriously through the instrumentality, as was said, of Mr. Charles Dr. la Bar Bodenham, a most kind and amiable young gentleman and a very zealous Catholic who was the last representative of an ancient Herefordshire family.

Service at St. Chad's was, and still is, most solemnly performed, an *Opus Dei* indeed.

That church served as the cathedral of the Midland district and the handsome gothic throne of the Vicar-Apostolic was placed in its Sanctuary. Nearly opposite the front of St. Chad's, was the Bishop's house; a brick building of Pugin, excellent in design and arrangement. The dining-hall had a high-pitched open roof and was (on a much smaller scale) like the dining-hall of a mediæval college. Adjoining the library was the Bishop's private chapel.

At the moment of our visit the Bishop was not in residence, but the head priest was, the Reverend John Moore, subsequently the third President of the college known as St. Mary's, Oscott. He was one of the most zealous promoters of that style of art which has the best right to be called "Christian," since both its first origin and its full development took place under Christian influence.

It was through him that our final conversion and reception, in the Bishop's private chapel, took place, at a second visit, some weeks later. Before that, however, two other visits were paid which it may not be without interest to our readers to record. The first of these was to the nascent Cistercian Abbey of Mount St. Bernard in Charwood Forest, Leicestershire. Its members were the representatives of religious who had been driven from France by the Revolution and who were for some time sheltered at Lulworth, Dorsetshire, by Mr. Weld, but who had now received the endowment of a considerable tract of land through the munificence of Mr. Ambrose de Lisle before mentioned. He also greatly aided them in the erection of their monastery which, in 1844, was rapidly

approaching completion under the superintendence and from the designs of Augustus Welby Pugin. We have since seen various other Cistercian abbeys on the Continent of Europe but we know of none which is, from an architectural point of view, so complete a reproduction of the past as is the Abbey of Charwood—although even yet, forty-seven years later, the monks have not, alas, acquired sufficient funds to enable them to complete their Abbey Church. Here the Cistercian life was, and still is, carried on in all its rigor, and St. Bernard, did he revisit the earth, would have no reason on this account to reproach his English sons. The first abbot—Abbot Palmer—was a man of singular simplicity, earnestness and straightforwardness; a very realization of an ideal Cistercian monk. The existence of this abbey and the life there carried on, had a potent effect on many minds in England and no small share in their conversion. The second visit was that paid to Nottingham, for the sake of seeing the large Church of St. Barnabas which Pugin was rapidly completing there. It was a cruciform building, most severe in style, with aisles and external chapel around and beyond the choir, beneath which was a crypt. The wooden sedilia were copied from those which were once in use at the great Abbey of Westminster.

Having an introduction to the local priest we were made to join his mid-day meal, at which were present the Bishop of the district and his coadjutor, and thus we became acquainted with the venerable Dr. Walsh and with his coadjutor—afterwards known all over the world as Cardinal Wiseman. With them (after visiting St. Barnabas) we travelled towards Derby, when, as the train waited at one of the stations, a remarkable-looking, handsome Protestant minister, most urbane in manner, entered the railway carriage and greeted the pair of bishops. This gentleman has since also acquired a world-wide renown as Father Faber, the Superior of the London Oratory, the author of "All for Jesus," and of so many other hymns now sung, we are told, on both sides of the Atlantic.

It was Dr. Wiseman's influence which finally disarmed domestic opposition to our reception into the Church. It was exercised on a father whose memory the lapse of time yet more endears, on account of the wise liberality of thought which blended in him with affectionate sympathy for conditions of mind which were not his.

An illustrious convert had shortly preceded us, namely, Mr. Scott Murray, then M. P. for Buckinghamshire and a great friend of Mr. Douglas, subsequently known as such a pious and exemplary Redemptorist, who built the charming little church of "Our Lady of Victories," in what was once the very hot-bed of Evangelicalism—Clapham.

But converts were still very scarce in spite of all the surging waves of controversy of that memorable time. They were "*Rari nantes in gurgite vasto*."

On this account the Rev. John Moore determined to turn each one to as much account, for purposes of edification, as might be possible, and so a nervous stripling of sixteen summers, was made to stand in the doorway of the rood screen, after High Mass on Sunday, and recite aloud, to the Clergy seated in front of him, the "Creed of St. Pius the Fifth."

That stripling has since felt that he may have done the right thing in the wrong way, by thus acting on his own judgment and anticipating the submission of his masters and teachers—Messrs. Wingfield, Ward, Oakley and Newman. To questions of philosophy and to difficulties touching the fundamentals of Christianity, he was as yet a stranger, but the logical outcome of the dispute between the Church and the churches, was as clear to him then as it has remained ever since.

Unfinished education had to be somehow completed, and Oxford which was to have been his destination was now made impossible owing to Catholic disabilities then existing at the English universities of the Isis and the Cam.

Therefore St. Mary's College, Oscott, was to be our abode for the next two years after a short interval which was to be spent in France in the company of the Rev. John Moore.

It was then that one of the more interesting pilgrimages was made which it was possible for an English Catholic to make. Alas, that it is no longer possible and alas, indeed, that, by an act of the clergy, it is no longer possible for an English Catholic to make such a pilgrimage again.

We set out in a hired carriage from a town south of Paris, to visit those most interesting cities of Sens and Auxerre and afterwards the Abbey of Pontigny; and here, by the way, a word of caution to travellers may not be out of place, for it is but too probable that the morals of the country drivers may not have been improved through the various political changes of the last five and forty years. Our shambling steed having at last justified our fears by coming to utter grief, the driver proposed to fulfil his contract by transferring us to another much larger vehicle, the driver of which was (as both drivers assured us) to keep the vehicle for our exclusive use for the rest of the journey. Then the Rev. John Moore showed that his disposition partook too much of the dove and too little of the serpent, for he paid the stipulated fare in advance, so as to allow the first driver to return remunerated in proportion to his services. Night came on and with it rain, and then first one, then two, then several persons of both sexes were taken

by our conductor up into his ark, against our earnest remonstrances. We should not have objected to some addition for the benefit of belated wayfarers, but we became crushed to suffocation by persons not only reeking of garlic, very wet and very dirty, but also very drunk. Our evident disinclination for their company was, of course, not understood, and was put down to the pride of confounded English aristocrats. Therefore small mercy as to pressure was accorded us, while, at not infrequent intervals, we were regaled with the then and there popular chorus:

"Jamais en France, jamais l'Anglais ne regnera."

The region we visited was rich in memories of our great St. Thomas of Canterbury, one of whose ample chasubles is preserved in the Cathedral of Sens.

The old Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny dates from the days of the first fervor of that austere order, and exemplified its protest against the luxuries—even the luxuries of church adornment—of the world of that day. The severe simplicity of its church remained and the luxury of stained glass had never been allowed within it. Nevertheless it was none the less permeated and imbued with the artistic spirit; and so the white glass of its windows, all in small pieces, was arranged, with the lead which held it together, in beautiful, though colorless, mosaic patterns.

We were conducted by the priest who served the church to some steps immediately behind the high altar. These we ascended and then saw in a shrine, through large apertures closed by crystal, the entire body of St. Edward Rich, formerly Archbishop of Canterbury, lying there as he had lain since the thirteenth century. His head bore on it the low mitre of his period; the ancient chasuble was gathered up in copious folds by his crossed arms, and the long and slender maniple and stole clearly showed, by their embroidery as well as by their shape, the antiquity of their date.

It was to us a solemn and impressive thing to gaze upon that venerable and sacred form, unchanged through all the centuries of war and revolution which have successively swept over the land.

In the spring of 1882 desiring to renew once more an experience which had for so many years been cherished by loving memory, we again visited Pontigny. A generation had passed away and irreverence and vulgarity had been rampant.

The precious old glass was removed and replaced by the most contemptible and vulgar colored glazing—all thought or care for the early Cistercian spirit and the long traditions since, had evidently departed. This was bad, but when we reached the shrine

itself, we found, to our horrified amazement the venerable form clothed in a staring, brand-new, white and gold, French chasuble of the most modern cut, and an enormous mitre to correspond! The ancient vestments—which surely themselves might be regarded as relics—had been taken off and were hanging in a museum which the priests of the place had got together.

We said to the conducting priest: "Surely such a change could not have been effected without damage to the body of the saint?"

"Oh," replied he, with a shrug of the shoulders and a most exasperating smile, "*Quelques petites dislocations!*"

Resuming the question of Catholicity in England, our next reminiscence concerns Oscott, where we went to reside as soon as we had returned to England.

St. Mary's, Oscott was a college which had been built, in part by Pugin, not long before, and shared with Downside (the Benedictine College) Old Hall (from Douay, in France), Ushaw College (also from Douay) and Stonyhurst (the Jesuit College), the task of educating the Catholics of England—and other countries, too—both clergy and laity.

The President of Oscott was Dr. Wiseman, then Bishop of Melipotamus, but some early distinguished converts were already in office there. Thus, the Vice-President was the Rev. Dr. Logan, who had been an officer in the army and has since been known—especially at Cambridge, where he had afterwards resided till his death—as a very distinguished mathematician.

The Hon. and Rev. George Spencer was the confessor of many of the lads and of the present writer amongst others, who has no words wherewith to fitly express his love and veneration for that precious spiritual guide. The Hon. George Talbot was then studying there for the priesthood. He had been an Anglican Rector, but in later years was widely known as the Monsignor Talbot residing at Rome and the valued friend of Pius IX. Another ecclesiastical student was the Rev. Bernard Smith, who had also resigned a valuable living (in Lincolnshire) of the Established Church, and is now a Canon of Northampton and still (what he has been for many years) the pastor of a lovely little church at Great Marlow, designed and raised by A. W. Pugin, at the expense of Mr. Scott Murray, the convert before referred to.

Another ecclesiastical student was Francis Amherst, the head of an old Catholic Warwickshire family. He was devoted to religious art, and had built, with Pugin's aid, a charming chapel at historic Kenilworth, near which was the family house. He subsequently died Bishop of Northampton, universally esteemed and beloved.

Lastly must be mentioned a very remarkable convert, a native

of that English fragment of the old Duchy of Normandy—the Island of Guernsey. This was M. Peter le Page Renouf, whose active, logical mind had quickly convinced him of the overpowering claims of the Catholic Church as compared with the Anglican Communion. He had therefore quitted Oxford before taking his degree and was now wearing a cassock at Oscott and hesitating as to whether he should go on for Priest's orders. This he did not do. On leaving Oscott he was for a time private tutor in one and another family in France, after which he became a professor at the Catholic University of Dublin, under Dr. Newman. After Dr. Newman's retirement, he was made a Government Inspector of Schools and finally received the appointment he still holds of a Keeper of Antiquities in the British Museum. While at Dublin he became known as an adept in the study of hieroglyphics, on which subject he is now one of the first authorities in the world. His reading had been wide, even when he came to Oscott, and he had an acquaintance with German philosophy, then rare in England. For the two years during which the present writer resided at Oscott, M. Renouf was his private tutor. It was under his tuition that we were first introduced to philosophy and various speculative views and historical facts which affected the whole basis of Christianity as conceived of by a raw young convert accustomed only to the controversy with Protestantism.

On an early day of our acquaintance he left written down in our room the subject for our afternoon work. Never shall we forget our dismay when we opened the paper he had left and read its only contents, which were:

“Analyse your ideas of Time and Space!”

Oscott College was, and is, a fine Gothic building with a noble library, the shelves of which were remarkably well furnished. Amongst other noteworthy works was an excellent copy of the Bollandists' “Lives of the Saints.”

The dining-room for the superiors, where we took our meals, was, and is, decorated with life-sized portraits of Dr. Wiseman and other persons of interest to Catholics, painted by the late Mr. Herbert, R. A.

The chapel was a handsome structure with a capacious sanctuary lined on either side with stalls. Its altars, furniture and decorations of all kinds were in the Gothic style, and all the chasubles used in it were of relatively ample proportions and neither French nor Roman.

Great pains were taken to make the lads understand ecclesiastical art, and to take an interest and acquire a knowledge of ritual. A. W. Pugin was the Art Professor, but we did not meet him there during our residence. We had however come to know him and a few words concerning him must terminate our retrospect.

We were taken by Mr. Scott Murray to call on Pugin, who was then residing in one of the quaint old houses of Cheyne Row, Chelsea, in company with his second wife, who showed us some of her Gothic jewelry, which had been made from her husband's designs. Pugin was a rather short, stoutish man with a pleasant face and a hearty cordial manner—he was always very kind to us. Singularly negligent in his dress, on one occasion when entering a first-class carriage in which were several men, a dandy amongst them addressed him, saying: "I think you have made a mistake in your carriage." "I have," he replied, "I thought I was coming amongst gentlemen!"

He was greatly beloved at Ramsgate where he lived and was most charitable. He was always very zealous as regards rescue from shipwreck. In the cause of Christian Art he uttered some extravagances, but then without enthusiasm no cause can be carried far. Thus he has been known to speak in depreciation of some one by saying, "My dear Sir! he is a man who does not know what a 'mullion' is." On one occasion he went up to George Spencer in a sacristy, where he was vested for benediction in a cope of bad design, and taking hold of the vestment said to him, "My dear sir, My dear Sir, what is the use of praying in a cope like that?"

In the year 1844 the very large church of St. George, at Southwark, was in course of erection and he was greatly tried by the financial conditions which rendered it impossible for him to carry out the plans he desired. This so seriously affected his health that it is believed to have hastened his end. He was beloved and esteemed by all those known to us who knew him. The effect he has produced in the world has been vast, and will be lasting, but he has by no means always received the credit which was his due, and which has been not unfrequently attributed to others. Thus his golden rule as to architecture was never to build anything for ornament, but to construct what was useful and then make serviceable vehicles for ornament. This saying has been assigned to Ruskin, but we have heard Pugin's own lips enunciate it at a date long anterior to Ruskin's teachings.

ST. GEORGE MIVART, F.R.S.

SECULAR EDUCATION.

IT is not the intention of the present essay to examine or compare the various methods of imparting instruction to youth, the branches which should compose the curriculum, the amount of time that the pupil should devote to each, or the nature and grade of ability requisite for the teacher. Certainly, when so many methods of teaching, at variance with and entirely opposed to each other, are employed—when, in one town or college, certain branches are systematically taught as fundamental, which, in the next city or university, are utterly ignored—when a twelve-month course of lectures suffices for graduation in medicine, half-as-much again provides us with legal ability, and preachers, or, at least, persons who desecrate the name by arrogating it to themselves, are manufactured with equal dispatch—when, in short, all grades of ability, or lack thereof, are employed in teaching, from the giddy miss of sixteen, whose letters disgust one by their silliness and unconscious display of crass ignorance, to the sleek professor of ancient languages, the merely elementary parts of which he but faintly comprehends—we say, that in a country where this is notoriously the case, the system of instruction pursued must manifestly be vicious, ought to be ventilated before the public, and to be re-established upon a correct basis. But we have no idea that such work can ever be accomplished by the “National Bureau of Education,” which, if not run, as is strongly suspected, merely in the interest of a few prominent publishing firms, is certain to find itself very soon their subservient instrument.

The depreciation of currency, or silver as compared with gold, is small and unimportant as compared with that which would ensue in the intellectual market-value of those who should go forth furnished with a governmental diploma; and, while Government has a right to emit her promises to pay, *ad indefinitum*, we maintain she has no right to stamp what may be, and under her auspices must, in the vast majority of instances, prove to be a poor article of brain and culture, as though it were sterling coin and legal intellectual tender.

The point is this: We believe, in all honesty, that the present system of public schools in the United States (and, wheresoever, under the control of government, no religious education and instruction are imparted simultaneously with the primary, academic, and scientific), is vicious, *per se*, and baleful to the individual so instructed, and to the community; and we propose, briefly, and in

all candor to give our reasons *for the faith that is in us*. We say nothing, save by implication, of the instruction and education given in the colleges and universities of our country (which we believe to be faulty, not merely from the want or inadequacy of religious training, but from their failure to impart the actual knowledge and consequent mental discipline which they profess to give; but we shall advert to these in another paper.

He who said, "Let me make the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws," would have been nearer the truth had he said, "Put into my power the selection of teachers in primary, secondary, and grammar schools, and I care not who may be their subsequent guides, or what their studies;" for, in these schools is laid that foundation which is little apt to be ever thoroughly upturned.

Now, as is frequently the case, the most of the disputes with which the periodical press teems on this so much vexed question of education, arise from misconception by the disputants of the terms employed, on either side, and very frequently from personal acrimony; and a desire to put down an antagonist has its share in the contest, so that, in the war of words, the real point of issue is lost to view. It is impossible for us to understand our antagonist, if he uses terms diverse in signification to express one and the same thing. It is equally as impossible for us to refute him, for what he says must be sheer nonsense. We may, it is true, combat what we think he means to say, though he fails in the expression of his meaning. But this is merely a multiplication of words to no purpose. We have no right in the argument to take for granted anything but what our opponent *says*, and thus we avoid setting up and vigorously overthrowing a man of straw; a process so common in debates upon education as to have become trite through "damnable iteration."

Men who have studied logic, so that it has become part and parcel of their minds (and to what use would the study be if such be not the result?), will see, at a glance, that the two terms, *education* and *instruction*, while almost invariably used as synonymous, in disquisitions on this and kindred subjects, are actually so in no respect. They will also perceive that many honest thinkers are, by this vague, indefinite, and interchanging use of the two terms, led to illogical results; and these are the men who do harm in matters pertaining to the moral and intellectual domain; we mean the honest and conscientious men who, though deceived, are themselves sincere. Your plausible man, who speaks or writes almost equally well on either side of any subject, soon becomes transparent even to the most indifferent or obtuse. Let us, then, have a clear understanding of the actual par value of these terms. It

is certainly quite as important as the value of Central R. R., Pacific Mail, or other stock this morning.

Now, *Education* is, and ought to be, both by its derivation and the usage of the word among thinkers and writers, *a disciplining of intellect hitherto untutored; the establishing of principles hitherto little known, unknown* (or rather floating in vacuo); *and the regulation of the sensibilities and moral affections hitherto sprouting forth in wild luxuriance.*

This is palpably very different from *Instruction*, which may properly be defined as *the imparting of a knowledge of facts, mental, physical, or moral, with the mode of using such knowledge for the greater advantage of the individual and of the community.*

Is it to be wondered, that when terms, inherently so different, have been constantly used as synonymous, so little headway should have been made in the discovery of the right and of the wrong in this matter? If, in mechanics, we make use of inadequate instruments, we shall attain inadequate results. In logic, the terms used are the instruments, and the results will be correct, or the reverse, just in proportion as we know, or do not know, the significance of our terms.

So much being premised, we contend that *instruction* without *education* is not only not a *desiderandum* but an *abominandum*, not only useless but really pernicious, and that better would it be to impart no specific instruction whatever to the rising generation, rather than that which has been so very appropriately named "Godless education."

We hold that of all curses, one which is most bitter both to society and the individual, each affecting the other, is the attainment of extensive knowledge without acquiring at the same time, firm moral principles and ability to control the passions and senses; and of this fact not only history but experience furnishes us with abundant proofs. But this is decidedly not only the tendency, but the professed aim of the public school system. According to this theory and practice, no actual religious instruction, as such, dares be given—the time of the pupil must be entirely occupied with the acquirement and memorizing of facts, and indeed the warmest defenders of the system contend that this acquisition of information, or as they delight to term it, "the diffusion of intelligence," will render mankind so impervious to the assaults of vice, that religion, technically so called, will become, as it were superfluous—the work being fully as well, or better accomplished by the fact-cramming process of the schools.

The system of public education has now had a fair trial of over fifty years in Prussia and more than forty years in the United States. In the former country it was the result of governmental

enactment, with little or no reference to the will of the people; in the latter, it was the apparent free-will offering of the larger majority of the people themselves, many of them doubtlessly thinking that such a system might be productive of good results. Long before this, the Greeks and Romans had tried the same thing in the matter of instruction, and we find on one and the same page of history the sage Socrates sacrificing a cock to Æsculapius, and the debauched but highly instructed Alcibiades living in an atmosphere of profligacy which astounded even the licentious Athenians of his day. Pericles and Aspasia, the writings of Aristophanes—of Lucian—of the author of “Eros and Anteros,” *et id omne genus*, prove the entire absence of all morality, or even semblance thereof, among the Greeks who certainly were, in their day, in full possession of all the “diffused intelligence” then diffusible. Their subsequent decay as a nation is, to the observing mind, thoroughly limned out in the kind of instruction imparted to the youth of the country. Voltaire and his imbecile admirers thought they had discovered something new when they undertook to flout the Almighty—but the Greeks justly claim the ground by right of prior discovery, for they could revile the ministers of their religion—the only one they knew, and objugate their gods with a venom not inferior and a sarcasm by far superior to the soi-distant philosophers of the eighteenth century. And though comparatively few of them were perfectly armed with this style of instruction, and their books still extant are few, we feel the ringing tone of thought of that class, as must ever be the case, for it permeates the whole of Greek society from *καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ* to the Helots, and in addition, to the downfall of the ancient Hellenic nationality—the results of that antique instruction are still felt by their scattered descendants, who reap the full force of the wrath of Him who has menaced to visit the “iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation.”

What shall we say of the Romans, the only other great power of antiquity of whose system of instruction history gives us more than a faint outline? They either substituted instruction for education, or the laws for the latter, thus ignoring religion entirely, and their own system (wretched as it unquestionably was), would yet have been preferable to none. As a result, we see that the *Liberti* (from the nature of their status in society, supple, knavish, and devoid of principle), had in their hands the training of the youth of Italy in her palmiest days. The earliest results we see are the extant writings of Plautus and Terence. Later we find the “*Ars Amatoria*” of Ovid and his epistles. Anon, Petronius Arbiter, Apuleius, Juvenal and Martial, Tibullus and Catullus, etc., till finally we descend to Joannes Secundus. This was the

literature of the people ; Virgil, Cicero and Horace (the latter frequently vile in his writings), were about as much read in comparison with the former, as are nowadays Milton and the Letters of Junius when compared with Swinburne or George Sand. We see the almost incredible depravity of the then people of Italy palpably evinced in the pictures, statues, paintings, utensils, furniture and decorations extant or otherwise excavated from their burial cities. We suppose that at the sight of the remains of the ancient Romans on view in the *Museo Borbonico*, there is not a man of this day, however depraved, who is not overcome with stupefaction at the fact that such a depth of infamy and obscenity could be imagined, still more that its existence should be unblushingly exposed in public and *coram familia*. Certainly no Christian, no upright Hebrew, sees them without a startled blush that he could belong to a race of men capable of such awful depravity. Shall we then wonder, that after incredible butcheries amongst themselves, conspiracies and insurrections immeasurable, Rome should have become a prey to the Goths and Vandals ? Nay, rather let us learn something from the lessons of history, and be prompt in preparing the remedy for ourselves.

Nor is it only from antiquity that the lesson comes to us. We may see elsewhere, and in modern times, that the same causes are producing the same results, and that whenever and wherever this diffusion of intelligence is going on, without reference to the "one thing needful," there also immorality is constantly on the increase. We have only to take up the papers of the day to discover that apathy or listlessness in religion, and opposition thereto, keep pace with the progress of that style of purely secular instruction which ignores religion ! The morals of Prussia among those thus taught need no comment to one who has traversed that country intelligently, and the shameless practical application on the part of the Prussian government of the dictum that "might makes right," will sufficiently indicate to the non-traveller what is the tone of public sentiment throughout the land. Now Prussia should be, were there any good in the system, the very model and example to all other countries, since two full generations of men now in active life have been brought up under that system of schooling which we so much deprecate. (We have in our own country not as yet attained the high moral ground of forcing parents to send their children to irreligious schools, but we are fairly embarked on the trip to that ultimate goal). It is well known that so-called rationalism and materialism have long pervaded the German schools of theology. We know that it is an extremely rare thing to meet with a *cultivated* (we use the word for want of a better) Prussian who does not sneer at the theory and practice of religion,

and while but a minority of them admit themselves Atheists, yet that is the real name to which a large majority of them are entitled, since they live "without God and without hope in the world." Marriage is a form revocable almost at pleasure; crime of every kind is rampant; fraud is esteemed knowledge of the way to live; debauchery is termed seeing life and derision of things sacred, a mark of intellectual culture.

In days long past we somehow inbibed the idea that the Scotch were an innocent and an educated people. We know that ample opportunities for instruction were provided, that the ministers of the multitudinous shades of religion were abundant among them; that a strong tendency to religious feeling exists in the race, and we thought that under such concomitants as we were taught to believe rife in that favored land, the Scottish peasantry must be very innocent and happy; indeed, we had no doubt that all this combination of circumstances might have surely been productive of good results. It is disagreeable to have one's idol shattered by the unrelenting opposition of facts demonstrated to eye and ear. One shrinks on finding that his theory, founded on what he believed to be correct information, will not bear the keen edge of statistics; so that we will just suggest to the inquirer after facts to glance at the Scottish statistics concerning bastardy, or to read the Scotch provincial papers for criminality, or to pass a few days in Glasgow, Inverness, or Kircudbright; and if he does not come to the conclusion that there is a talent for profanity there developed, a universality and depth of drunkenness there displayed, speaking loudly in regard to the educational (God help us all!) influences at work, then we confess we must have visited the towns mentioned at an unfortunate juncture, read the papers without understanding them, and summed up the statistic tables incorrectly.

In our own country, who dares contend that we have become purer or better; that crime diminishes as instruction is diffused; that religion prospers in sequence with such intellectual instruction; or that public or private faith is better kept? We make all admissible allowance for the rapid increase of our population by immigration as well as for the deteriorating effects of the civil war upon morals; but with every possible grant of this and similar sort, we are constrained to admit the steady lowering of morals. Cunning and trickery become in business daily more shameless; honor and integrity are rapidly becoming by-words; a striking deterioration is going on both in private and in public life. Time has been within our own recollection when a high municipal office was considered a sufficient endorsement of personal integrity; when a State legislator was necessarily a man who could not be bought; when a member of Congress would have considered him-

self insulted by the mere suspicion of collusion with any "ring" or "alliance," and when a Senator of the United States was really what he was firmly believed to be, viz., *the impersonation of high moral and political honor!* We only ask almost any observant and intelligent man: Is this so now? What is our literature? Instead of the "Federalist," we have buncombe orations sounded from Dan to Beersheba. Impeachments are made and the measure voted down by the self-same parties. We say nothing of wholesale theft, even of the Presidency. Men sent by the people to vote, manage to be conveniently absent when an issue of importance arises, or the tide is watched to find on which side it may be popular to vote, or if present, they discover suddenly, by the aid of tangible arguments to their credit in the banks, that cimmerician darkness had hitherto absolved them. Trashy novels are the mental pabulum of readers; prurient pictures of police news and sporting gazettes usurp the place of—we will not say *pious* or *moral* (it would be too ridiculous!) but of simply innocuous reading. Our young men swear, drink, gamble, and manage to debauch themselves like young lords—where that style of cattle exists; our young women corrupt the tide of their lives, physical and moral, by gloating over the lascivious pictures or descriptions of the *bordelle*, or the ocular manifestations of shows and theatres. Orphan asylums and foundling hospitals are filled to repletion, and our ecclesiastical authorities find it necessary to warn publicly against infanticide *ante partum, post partum* and *in partu!* Truly our mode of instruction is diffusing information with a vengeance! Divorces have become most sickeningly common; the marriage tie is held of light value, more easily dissolved than an ordinary trade partnership. Abandonment is of daily occurrence. Are not murders and burglaries rife? Is not intoxication by both liquors and opiates on the increase? Is prostitution declining, or does it not rather flaunt itself, with ever-increasing boldness, in the full face of day? We need hardly say anything of profane and blasphemous swearing—so common, that one fears to take children or females of the family to any public place.

Now it may be said: "These things are sadly patent in the large cities, but they do not pervade our whole country; they exist in the great marts of traffic, but are unknown in the rural districts, and in the smaller cities and towns." Unfortunately this is not the case. The youth of Minneapolis and Omaha can and do curse and drink, talk slang and obscenity equally with the most proficient New York rough or Baltimore plug. "They swear terribly in the army at Flanders," quoth my Uncle Toby; but for the most appalling taking of God's name in vain, we could give a point or two to the Rev. Lawrence Sterne! As to honesty in

dealing, among merchants and manufacturers we might waive the "shoddy contracts" of the war, and the gambling in stocks and lands; the lotteries approved by law in some States, and pass on to the "diffusion of intellectual attainment" in the adulteration of food, etc. If the *World's* chemist failed to find a pure article sold among all the grocers and druggists whose stock he sampled; if weight was scant and chicory superabundant in coffee at New York, what must the parents of our young Minneopolitans and Omahaans be drinking there, or further on, beyond borders of civilization? No. Our large cities are but *a large stock on hand* of the population, samples of which we have distributed North, South and West to the Pacific. Having travelled over the country pretty extensively, we know in sadness what we affirm. But it is a long story, nor likely to be a popular one. A very reliable authority has said: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Was the fall in common honesty a sequence of too much catechism?

But even beyond this and in a worse form we find that deceit and hypocrisy have permeated the body politic and social to such an extent that it is not uncommon for persons who wish to succeed in particular localities (whether as politicians, professional or business men) to take a pew in, or make themselves members of the special church society which may then be fashionable. This is considered a very clever "dodge," and thus some of the most profane swearers, gamblers and habitual violators of every command of the Decalogue are found acting as wardens, vestrymen, trustees or influential members of churches, or meeting-houses, in various places that we wot of. A friend of ours, who, though an irreligious man—unregenerate, he called it—was no hypocrite, told us that he was actually advised to become a member of a certain sect for a *specific purpose* and he was laughed at by a member of the said sect for this "over-squeamishness" when he objected on the rather fair grounds that he did not believe in the doctrines. His adviser volunteered the pithy remark that he had personally "*made money by the operation!*" Here, however, is the test—the *experimentum crucis*. Does it matter, if you possess \$500,000, in what way you acquired it? Suppose you have become possessed of it by swindling government or individuals, as fraudulent distiller or brewer, or member of some whisky combination; by gambling successfully in stocks or railroad, or at faro, or by sharp betting on race-horses; can you not—yes or no—simply on the ascertained fact that you are the possessor of that sum of money, go into any society, or *celebrate*, that you may select, with few and rare exceptions, from Maine to Florida, from New York to San Francisco? *Success* is demanded, not personal honor or mental ability, and

success is nowadays understood to mean *money*. While the germs of this public and private corruption exist, of course, in human nature, yet we find that their vigorous growth and luxuriant manifestation have commenced and gone on in the same years and *pari passu* with the Godless instruction of the public schools. We must see, if we will take the trouble to observe, that it is increasing therewith, and that it threatens speedily to sap the foundation of our government by depriving parents of their rights, so that the final toppling over of the edifice will hardly be a loss, so corrupt shall we by that time have become as a people, or as they term it, a nation.

We affirm in like manner, that neither the general, nor the State, nor any other government that ever has existed—saving the Theocratic—can or ought properly to be the dispenser of *instruction*; as to what we have defined as *education*, no one will thoughtfully contend that government should dare to take the task from parents. If we look at Prussia, where attendance is mandatory and where (it must be admitted), the teachers are, for the most part highly competent to impart the instruction required in the various grades of their schools, a great injustice is done to that large class of the population who prefer no similar instruction for their children to the Godless one there imparted—and think, in short: “What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, and suffer detriment in his soul?” And, indeed, up to date, it has not quite yet been asserted that science, or intellectual attainment has saved any one. In our own country (and here would be a chance to make great protestation of loyalty and love for the land of our birth—but we fear those who protest too loudly!) there is super-added to this injustice the fact, that owing to the mode in which the details are carried out in this system, the entire working becomes a very complicated method of sham and swindle; for whereas in Prussia the teachers are almost always competent as mere instructors, and the examiners and referendaries posted as to their duties, this is by no means invariably the case with us, whether as regards the examination of teachers for appointment or of pupils for advancement. The “Boards of Education” are notoriously selected without, in the very nature of the case, much, or even any reference to a knowledge of the subject with which they have, or should have to deal, but rather, it would seem, with a remarkably clear reference to their utter want of any knowledge worth mentioning of the matter, and probable inability to acquire it. In many places, a ward or pot-house politician, a vender of lager beer, a cigar-maker, and a carpenter (the last two may be very good and valuable members of society *quasi* cigar-making and building), are fair samples of the men who do up the educational business

as by law established! By these, teachers are to be examined, appointed or displaced—books to be noticed and introduced, or rejected—plans of study to be arranged—punishments or their hindrance to be made lawful—contracts to be made—property to be purchased and sold—and supplies of all kinds to be attended to. These men are competent for this multifarious duty or they are not; which is it? Now, that such and similar men are appointed to this arduous task is quite inherent in the system so long as it is a state affair, and consequently a political matter, and the fact of the appointment of such men to this office, is so universally the concomitant of the system of “School Boards,” that people who are sensible cannot divest themselves of the opinion that “School Boards” and corruption walk for the most part hand-in-hand, or with a very narrow intervening space. All who read the papers know how contracts are jobbed—how and what kinds of school-books, etc., are supplied—how often text-books are changed, and what influences appoint and retain teachers. Now, we would object to this kind of instruction, even if it were the very best article, yet it is not that; and we still more strongly object to it when we discover it to be a spurious imitation of an originally worthless note. We object to it being put in the power of such men as have almost invariably controlled the system as now existent, to say who shall teach our children, or from what books they shall acquire information; and if men must swindle, there are so many (more *legitimate* we had almost said), less injurious modes of doing so, that we would fain close up this opening by which incalculable injury is inflicted upon helpless parents and their offspring. So long as the State has control of instruction in our country, the public school system must be, under present auspices, a political machine—here radical—there democratic—and neither long in any one place. The precarious tenure of position by teachers—the frequent changes of books and modes of instruction—the fraud incident to the control of money not their own, by men in no way individually responsible for its proper use, are so many crying voices against the whole system. The government might as well supply us to-morrow with a new religion, details of worship to be managed by the politicians, etc., aforesaid, remarking at the same time to us: “You need not believe this as yet, but you must pay your quota towards the requisite buildings—the support of ministers and the maintenance of worship. You are at perfect liberty to pay for the support of your own church, until such time as we may deem fit to exact uniformity in this as in other governmental matters.”

Hence it follows also, that a gross injustice is done by our State governments, in imposing taxes for the maintenance of the public

schools upon those who are not only not benefited but positively injured by it. Why, surely we are even now ready to admit the injustice done the tax-paying negroes of by-gone years in forcing them to pay for the support of schools, to which they could not send their children—judges learned in the law, having clearly shown that while it was highly CONSTITUTIONAL for the negro father to pay school tax, it was equally as highly unconstitutional for Sambo, junior, to go to that or any other school. If we do not mistake, the Common Council of Baltimore had it in contemplation, at one time, to refund to the negro schools (established by the negroes on their own account), the sum total of school-tax arising from the negro population of the city during several years. We do not know whether it was ever carried into effect, since just about that time, a change came over the spirit of Baltimore's political dream—and politics render consciences very elastic. In any case, we are now obliged either to furnish schools for the negroes—to admit them to our own, or to turn over to them the tax which they pay for the support of this system, said money to be by them disposed of as they may deem best in the procurement of instructional facilities. How should it not then be apparent, even on the most superficial glance, that it is wrong to take the property of Catholics for the support of schools, which they, if conscientious, cannot patronize, very much puzzles our comprehension. What! Must I not only see a wrong daily enacted before my eyes, but also pay for the support of that wrong? Not only passively endure the injury done myself and others, but actively contribute thereto by my purse? Even England of "penal law" infamy, saw at length the glaring and flagrant injustice done the poor Catholic Irish, in requiring them to support that enforced Church-system which they detested and, as Catholics, did abhor; but it seems the United States is the country where a Catholic must not only support his own schools, where the education which he wants is imparted, but he must also pay for the support of others with which he has nothing in common—whose tendencies he abominates—and rather than send his children to which, he prefers they shall entirely forego instruction, barring what he may himself have time and ability to impart. This may be law, but it is not justice, and we have faith enough to believe in the eternal principles of justice in opposition to any law ever enacted.

It may be well also to bear in mind that while there are over 6,000,000 of Catholics, yet they are not the only persons aggrieved as individuals, or in their collective capacity. Many of the straighter sects of Presbyterians detest the common school, or pauper-school system, for reasons [similar (*mutatis mutandis*) to those for which Catholics oppose it. That highly reputable, lib-

eral and learned body of Reformed Presbyterians, whose synod seriously proposed setting the Deity on a proper basis by getting the matter lobbied through Congress to a constitutional position, certainly cannot desire to debar the Omnipotent from the schools; the Jews cannot, and from what we know of them, do not relish much the scraps of New Testament daily flung to them after the fashion in which the oath is administered at the Custom House, Badinage apart, there are hundreds of thousands of educated (not merely instructed) Protestants of every hue and shade, who object to the system on account of its tending to materialism and infidelity, both leading directly to immorality, and in consequence they do not patronize it. Are then the belief and consciences of all these not to be taken into account at all? Would it not be infinitely better, were the State to propose this: "We will collect and hand over to you the tax paid by yourselves, with which money you *must* instruct but may *educate* the children of your own faith. We require all the children to be instructed; you want them also educated according to your views as parents. We will certainly in this free land not force you to support schools by which you cannot benefit, and we stand ready to allow any considerable sect the same privilege, not as a matter of favor, but as a right. Meantime we shall run our own Godless schools for those whom they suit, *but also with their own funds.*"

This is so evidently just that it doubtless would have been done years ago (as it is now done in Savannah, Georgia, and other places in that enlightened State), had it not been for the "*Native American*," "*No Popery*," and "*Know Nothing*" cries, which arose about the time when the real tendency of these schools began to dawn upon the people's minds. Similar cries, reappearing at intervals, have frightened the timorous up to the breaking out of the Civil War. We know how readily the mental perception of statesmen even, much more of the populace, becomes obfuscated by expediency, in view of the temporary howl of the hour, and thus, those who have expressed themselves correctly, recounted in the presence of "Sam," the catchword of ignorant bigots. Those who had not given utterance to their belief, but yet saw the right, counselled in view of the then existing rancor, quiet and delay, and thus this monstrous injustice has been saddled upon the Catholics during one-half a century.

We meet once in a while with sensible and liberal-minded men of the various Protestant denominations, who while admitting the injustice of the enforced law, still evidently think that it is rather a matter of feeling than of principle. With deference to all such as regard the matter in that light, we will say, a Protestant may attend the ministrations of another denomination. He can, and often does, and that too in strict accordance with his Protestant

principles, send his children to a Catholic school or college. Witness the schools of the Jesuits, or those of the Sisters of Charity, or of the many teaching orders. The Catholic, on the contrary, if he be so in any thing but the mere name, violates his conscience by so doing, and ceases to act in accordance with the teachings of the Church. The situation of the Catholic on the subject is very much that of the conscientious Protestant, if required by law, in a Pagan land, to violate one of the Ten Commandments or pay for immunity from said demand. He could assuredly purchase freedom from an unjust vexation. Now the Catholic, in our case, must violate his conscience, were he to send his children to the public schools, if he believes them to be mere nurseries of disbelief in religion and injurious to morals. He pays for immunity by his taxes, which go, unfortunately, to their support, and then he pays once more for the support of his own school in which he has confidence. None but a Catholic can thoroughly appreciate Catholic feeling on this subject, one which appeals to them more strongly than any other except their own personal salvation. In short, Catholics cannot lawfully expose their children to the proximate dangers of a course of non-religious instruction without most powerful safeguards, not readily attained, under a penalty of failing totally in the discharge of their duty as members of Christ's visible Church; and this involves appalling consequences.

However much we may differ as to modes of instruction or subject to be pursued, there are but few God-fearing men in any sect who fail to perceive that coequally with every advance in secular knowledge there should be a corresponding advance in the all-important knowledge of God, our duties towards Him and to our fellow-man. We put it then to all such of whatsoever name, that the injustice is done indirectly to them, though directly to us, who are a unit upon this subject (witness our schools and colleges), and who constitute a numerical majority over all those combined who join with us in opposing this oppressive, inefficient, corrupt and unjust school system. Nearly all the sects of Protestantism tacitly acknowledge by their Sunday-schools the necessity for religious education, and by implication, the inefficiency of the public schools. If they sincerely believe themselves in the right, they cannot fail to desire that their children may be brought up the same way. Now the Sunday-school has proved everywhere to be a very insufficient *suppedaneum* (*seu succedaneum*) to the week-day public school; the amount of bread is lamentably small for such copious sack (*with lenic therein, Hal!*) the antidote is not sufficient to counteract the poison, and their cause, did they but see it, is on this subject identical with our own, as indeed it was in Ireland, for example, though they refused long to see it, on the subject of Church disestablishment or disendowment. We trust and believe that

there are, after all, not many in this country who will imitate the folly of the stupid and bigoted dissenting Orangemen of the North of Ireland, by saying that they would rather submit to an injustice than to have the despised Papists relieved therefrom. It must be, therefore, from apathy, want of zeal, or lack of examination of the subject that our usually kind Protestant brethren have been so backward in putting their shoulders to the work for the removal of this revolting wrong from us both.

We have called it an injustice; it is more. It is a galling tyranny, and there is none more withering than that which violates conscience. Nor will the rights of conscience infringed, cry out always in vain. For some time past it has pleased Almighty God to put a stop to the rabid howls of those insane zealots and knaves combined, who used, from time to time, to sound the tocsin of "None but Americans on guard to-night"! (as if we were not Americans born and bred), "Down with the Pope!" etc.; and consequently the country might now calmly, in view of the justice of the case, pure and simple, ponder over the matter, and gracefully concede that which its inherent equity will ultimately force. It may be, too, the upright concession will come at a time, and with as poor a grace, as did the desuetude of the "penal laws" in England—the Act of Catholic Emancipation—the disestablishment of the Anglicans in Ireland, or that other act of emancipation for which reason and justice called in vain for more than half a century, but which actual self-interest finally and oddly carried! We are certainly not of those who believe in optimism, who expect the millennium one of these fine mornings, or who found large hopes for the speedy winding up of sublunary affairs on the proximate fulfilment of the prophecy concerning the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, or the "*time and times and half a time*"

But Americans are rational and very keen-sighted people, and we have that confidence in them that we do not think it would be possible, at this late day, to re-enact for example in New York, the history of the Jesuit Father Kaufmann, who was sentenced during colonial times for refusing to divulge what he could only have known through the Sacrament of Penance. We trust, also, that it will soon be possible even in New Hampshire or Connecticut, to hold office without swearing to "support the Protestant religion"; that the experiences of the late war have taught our Protestant brethren, as well as that much more numerous class, who have no religion at all, the *impropriety* of burning convents as at Boston, or churches as at Philadelphia. And finally, we feel confident that this most iniquitous tax will speedily be removed not only from Catholics but from all who feel its continuance an infringement of right. We do not doubt that the time is fast approaching when the State will confine herself to her legitimate duties of the which

there are enough, and those sufficiently onerous, without undertaking to supply us with a secular instruction which we do not want in any other manner than as a hand-maid to religion and, with which, so accompanied, no government *can* furnish us. Were it even possible, such a power is too liable to abuse, to be left in any governmental hands; and finally, upon *parents*, as such, devolves the responsibility for the souls of their offspring, and we dare not even if we could, shift it from where the Almighty has placed it.

The venerable Archbishop Hughes of New York, explains this subject very fully in a series of letters published in the 40's, and his arguments were so clear—his reasoning so cogent and irrefragable, that almost all who took any practical interest in the subject, were convinced that he held the correct grounds, and the object of the present paper is rather to recall the attention of Catholics to the facts and deductions of that lamented Prelate than to enter into the minutiae of the controversy that ensued. Mr. Seward expressed himself publicly and privately as convinced of the justice of the claims of the Church, but at that time Catholics were comparatively few, and a political campaign on *anti-Catholic* principles was just looming up. He shrank therefore, under the circumstances, from maintaining his convictions, and the seed sown by the excellent Archbishop, fell upon stony ground; it was addressed to hearts harder than stone, viz., those of men, mad with political excitement and maddened yet more by the galling reflection that they were wilfully in the wrong. A great change has since that time taken place in the manner in which Catholics as units and Catholicity as a system are regarded by our fellow-citizens not of the Faith. The Church is now a power, small, it is true, as to numbers when compared with the immense hosts of her adversaries, but the armor of her opponents is frail, their weapons broken or blunted—the discipline of the foe is very imperfect—the coherence of the armies almost null. The Church grows; she is ever the same; her trained forces, though small relatively, are more than a match for the discordant hosts of the enemy at variance among themselves, and whose leaders are bitterly jealous of each other. Large numbers the world over, convinced, that in her bosom is salvation, are daily entering her fold, and it would seem from the signs of the times to be the will of God that in this country, at least, and for a while, she should enjoy a season of rest, of peace and tranquillity. But it does not follow that it is the right thing for those who are in authority to become apathetic, or not to use all the means in their power, and put forward all possible efforts for the suppression of such grievous wrongs as still bear heavily upon her, and to prevent the imposition of others, come they in what guise they may.

THOMAS A. BECKER, D.D.

Scientific Chronicle.

AERIAL NAVIGATION.

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

READER, have you ever dreamt of flying? If so, you have been blest; if not, you have missed one of the most glorious experiences of life. With us it has ever been a favorite dream, and sunny reminiscences of it run back almost to the twilight of childhood. And the process is so simple. No extra attachments of wings or feathers are needed; only a flapping, bird-like, movement of the arms, and a frog-like movement of the other extremities, and lo, up and away you go with ease, and with as much grace as may be. In our flights, sometimes hundreds of hissing serpents, sometimes packs of snarling wolves, sometimes howling tigers and roaring lions would become interested in the performance, and savagely cheer us on for miles together, but we never seemed to experience a thought of fear, nor the least dread of losing the wonderful power, nor even the slightest sensation of fatigue.

Over houses and steeples and mountains,
Over valleys and rivers and oceans,
We have floated along in our dreaming
Rejoicing in power and freedom;
As wild as the bird, and as eager,
To drink in the misty, blue ether,
And bathe in the glorious sunshine.

We do not imagine we are exceptions in this matter. Perhaps many, perhaps nearly all, have had similar experiences. However, we have made no inquiries, and so we only answer for ourselves.

Is there now some mystical meaning in all this? Is there in it some shadow of an undefined yearning, beyond the power of science to explain? We do not pretend to know; and if we did know, this is not the place to enlarge upon it. We leave it therefore, to talk prosaic science.

From a physiological point of view, man seems to be pretty well fitted to get through this world by walking; and to be but poorly adapted to imitate the mode of locomotion of either the fish or the bird, not having fins and gills like the one, nor wings and feathers like the other. And yet, since he is monarch of all he surveys, it should not seem strange if he attempted to rival them, even in their own specialties. No doubt, he early acquired the art of swimming; and we know that there are to-day savage tribes who are about as much at home in the water as on the dry land, and who attack the ferocious shark, hand-to-hand, even on his own chosen field of battle. Yet, in a fair swimming contest, nobody would for an instant refuse the first prize to the shark. It is not

in this way that man has acquired his mastery over the seas. Neither is it in this way that he will eventually acquire, beneath the waters, the mastery, which he now has at their surface.

The fish makes use of whatever physical power God has given him, and that's the end of it. Man lays his hand upon the powers of nature, and makes them subservient to his will. From the day when man first crossed some little arm of the sea, on a raft of rough logs, with a rag for a sail, to the day when he stands, a proud speck, on the deck of a monster steamship, the work of his own hands, itself but a speck on the bosom of the boundless deep, he has been struggling for the mastery, and he feels that he almost has it in his hand. No denizen of the ocean, not even the whale, will now dispute it with him, and the great sea-serpent himself seems to have retired from the contest. We have heard nothing of him now for several months.

Turn we now to the other point. If man's physical build renders him ill adapted to play the part of the fish, he would evidently make a still more unlikely bird. In swimming, his whole weight is sustained by the buoyancy of the water, and he has need of muscular effort merely to keep himself right end up, and to propel himself onward. On the other hand, the air supports but a very small fraction of his weight, in fact less than four ounces, for a man of medium size, so that, if he would fly, he must raise practically his whole weight, and this with no more solid support than the air itself. The problem looks hopeless, and yet, from the very earliest times even down to our own days, man has coveted the mastery of the air as well as that of the waters.

It is related that Dædalus and his hopeful son Icarus, having been imprisoned by Minos, King of Crete, made wings for themselves of feathers, cemented them on with wax, and so flew away and escaped. But boys will be boys, and Icarus, boy-like, disobeyed his father's injunction not to fly too high, and soared so far that the heat of the sun melted his wings off, and falling into the sea, he was drowned. The sea and the island of Icaria, named after the boy, are there to this day to bear witness to the truth of the story. Perhaps we are too hard to satisfy, but we hope to be pardoned if we think that the whole affair looks more like a flight of imagination on the part of the poet who relates it, than a real mechanical flight.

According to Suetonius, Simon Magus, in the time of Nero, attempted to fly from the roof of one house to another, but failed in the attempt, and was killed by the fall. There is no intrinsic impossibility in this, and so we let it pass. Again, during the middle ages, many attempts were made at flying, by means of artificial wings, but they all seem to have ended in disaster. The only case with which we are acquainted, which was a decided success every time, was Mother Goose's Old Lady, who used regularly to go up on a broom and sweep the cobwebs from the sky. But alas, the modern scientist refuses to believe even this.

Seriously speaking, we are fully convinced that man, as we know him, is not able, and never will be able, to fly by purely muscular effort, no matter how many wings and feathers he may take unto himself. Birds

do it, but, weight for weight, birds are many times stronger than the strongest men. Notwithstanding this, a certain number of men have been discussing for years past, in scientific journals the mechanism of the flight of birds, with the ultimate end of learning to fly themselves. Each one of them is perfectly sure in his own mind, that he knows all about it; but we modestly confess that we understand none of them, and never hope to. Let us see one of these gentlemen put his knowledge in practice and soar aloft on his borrowed pinions, and, at the same time, let us be reasonably convinced that the devil is not at the bottom of it all, then we will begin to believe in the possibility of human flight. No, if ever man succeeds in navigating the air it will not be by his muscular power, but by means of machinery. This, indeed, was sufficiently proved by Borelli, more than two hundred years ago, and if any one were found at the present day still clinging to the old idea, we would certainly hold his sanity in very serious doubt.

Machine flying is therefore the next in order, and the first thought that seems to have taken hold on the minds of men, in connection with this idea, was, that if some means could be found of being buoyed up on the air, as a vessel is on the water, then locomotion and steering would easily follow, and so the whole problem would be solved. Various means to this end have at different times, been proposed, some good enough in principle but impossible of practical realization, some bad all around. Queer indeed are the explanations given at times of the expected results.

Albert of Saxony, a monk of the order of St. Augustine, thought that, as fire, according to Aristotle, is more attenuated than air, and floats above our atmosphere, if a light hollow globe were filled with that substance, it would rise to a certain height and remain suspended. Caspar Scott, a Jesuit, adopted substantially the same speculation; only he proposed to replace the fire by the thin, distant, ethereal blueness which he believed floated above the air. He never succeeded in laying in a stock of this useful substance, and the project failed in consequence.

Again, it was believed that the dew was of celestial origin, being shed by the stars, and that it was drawn up to heaven in the course of the day by the heat of the sun. Hence it was thought that hen's eggs, filled with morning dew and exposed to the heat of the sun would ascend to the sky, and, at nightfall descend to the earth. So, with a sufficient number of these and a suitable car, a man could dine above the clouds and return to earth for supper. We do not find that it ever occurred to the people of those days that it would be just as well to drink the morning dew and dispense with both car and egg shells? Neither can we find out why hen's eggs in particular were chosen at a time when geese were so abundant. This will probably ever remain a blank among the pages of history.

Another scheme, similar to that of Father Scott, but a little more definite, was put forward, as late as 1755, by Joseph Galien, a Dominican. He was a professor of philosophy and theology at Avignon, and spent his spare moments in dreaming about flying-machines. He wanted to

collect, not the fire nor the ether, but the thin air of the upper regions, and enclose it in a vessel extending more than a mile every way and intended to carry fifty-four times as much weight as did Noah's ark. Truly, this was a grand idea, vast, majestic, chimerical. These will suffice as specimens of a list of the interminable fables and follies and rubbish under which this business was buried for centuries.

Somewhat better than these, because it contained at least one true principle, was the suggestion of Francis Lana, a Jesuit, whose works were published at Brescia in 1670. Torricelli in 1643 had shown how a vacuum might be produced by means of mercury or water in tubes, and Lana, taking the hint, reasoned that since there is nothing lighter than nothingness, a light vessel *filled with that*, would have a great ascensional force. He therefore planned a machine after the following fashion: make four hollow balls of copper, each 25 feet in diameter and $\frac{1}{15}$ of an inch in thickness. Attach them by vertical rods above the corners of a basket about 75 feet square, and then exhaust them of air by Torricelli's method. A mast carrying a spare-sail is to be planted in the middle of the basket.

Lana made all his calculations very nicely, whence it resulted that the ascensional force of the four balls together would be from 1100 to 1200 pounds. This would be quite enough to raise the basket, sail and several passengers. The plan never got beyond the paper on which it was described. Its weak point was in this, that when exhausted of air, each ball would have to sustain an atmospheric pressure, tending to crush it, of over 2000 tons. Lana himself saw the difficulty, but he thought that a truly spherical form would enable the balls to sustain even that enormous pressure. Doubtlessly it would, but who ever saw or heard tell of a *perfectly* spherical shell? No sane mechanic, even at the present day, would undertake to make one, especially of such a size. There is, of course, no intrinsic impossibility in it, any more than there is in balancing a sewing needle on its point on the edge of a razor, but we can safely predict that no one will ever succeed in doing either. More than that; for even if it were possible to build such a shell, it would be totally impossible to keep it in shape when built, unless it were kept afloat in a perfectly calm atmosphere. If it touched the earth, or came in contact with anything whatever, it would become slightly deformed, and then the external pressure would do the rest, that is, crush and crumple it like an empty paper bag. The idea, however, of making a body rise in the air by giving it a less specific gravity, as a whole, than the air itself, was perfectly correct, but the means proposed were altogether impractical and inadequate.

One would have thought that the world might have learned something in the course of two hundred years, and yet, within the last four years a gentleman of New Jersey, actually brought Lana's project forward again, only on a more gigantic scale. He was to build a cylinder 100 feet in diameter and 500 feet long, the ends being conical. It was to be of steel, not thicker than the paper of this REVIEW, and when exhausted of air would have an ascensional force of about 145 tons. It

was said that the United States Government had appropriated \$75,000 to carry on the experiment. We cannot vouch for all the statements made to us, but we remember predicting humbly at the time, that the project would come to grief, and we were informed later on that such was the case. We need not be surprised at that, when we bear in mind that the cylinder would have to support a pressure, tending to crush it, of something like 185,000 tons.

It is time now to leave the region of chimeras and turn to what was rewarded with at least a partial success. The credit of launching the first balloon is due to Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier, sons of a celebrated paper-maker of Annonay, about forty miles from Lyons, in France. They had observed the suspension of clouds in the atmosphere, and it occurred to them that if they could enclose any vapor of the nature of a cloud in a light bag, it might rise and carry the bag with it into the air. They therefore made paper bags, nearly spherical in form, with a circular opening underneath. These they held over a fire of straw, so as to allow the smoke to enter the bags, when much to their delight, the bags rose and floated in the air of the room.

Feeling sure of their ground, they now determined to give a public exhibition on a large scale. Accordingly they made a bag of linen, for greater strength, and lined it with paper the better to keep in the smoke. It was about 35 feet in diameter and weighed 500 pounds. They supported it in its collapsed condition by a string from an outrigger, inflated it over a fire made by burning bundles of chopped straw, and when they found it was beginning to ascend they cut the string and let it go. It rose rapidly to about a mile in height, floated away for a couple of miles and then slowly descended, having been in the air about ten minutes. This was the invention of the balloon. It does not detract from the credit due to the Montgolfiers, on the contrary it rather adds to it, that millions of others had seen clouds floating in the atmosphere, and might have invented the balloon. The fact is that they didn't, whereas Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier did, and in that lies all the difference. However, they were woefully astray as to the cause of the phenomenon. They imagined, it seems, that the balloon ascended on account of some power inherent in the smoke, and it was not till quite a while afterwards that the true cause was recognized, viz., the lightness of the heated air in the balloon as compared with an equal volume of the cooler air outside. All gases, air included, expand on being heated, and consequently become rarefied, and will therefore tend to ascend when surrounded by a denser atmosphere. The amount of ascensional force will be precisely the difference between the weight of a given volume of the rarer and that of the same volume of the denser gas. If their difference be sufficiently great, the rarefied air in the balloon will not only tend to ascend itself, but will be able to carry a certain amount of dead weight with it, as the material of the balloon and its appendages. In the Montgolfiers' first balloon no source of heat was taken up, and hence the air inside was rapidly cooled by radiation and the balloon could not long remain suspended. The exhibition spoken of above

took place at Annonay on June 5, 1783, in presence of quite a large concourse of people, whose enthusiasm naturally knew no bounds. The news of this event spread rapidly over Europe and even to America, and ballooning soon became the fashion of the day.

About two months later, the two Robert brothers built a balloon with the intention of repeating at Paris the experiment of the Montgolfiers. They made it of silk, and varnished it with a solution of elastic gum, the better to keep in the smoke. It was about 13 feet in diameter. Before proceeding to the experiment however, they luckily consulted James A. Charles, Professor of Physics in Paris, and he persuaded them to fill their balloon with hydrogen. This gas had been discovered but a few years before, and was not much known outside of the laboratory. The Robert brothers agreed to the proposal, and on August 27, 1783, an immense concourse of people assembled, filling every available spot on and around the Champ de Mars. At 5 o'clock P.M., at a signal given by the discharge of a cannon, the balloon was set free. It rose to the height of three-quarters of a mile, remained in the air nearly an hour, and fell at a distance of fifteen miles from the starting point. The peasants who saw it fall were terrified, but valiant in the midst of their fears, they attacked the monster and having gained the usual signal victory, tore the balloon to shreds. Hydrogen was at that time called "inflammable air," and hence balloons of the Charles type have frequently been called "air-balloons," while the Montgolfier kind have naturally been known as "fire-balloons."

It was not apparent at first which would turn out to be the better kind, and so each inventor had his adherents, and experimented with his own invention. On the 19th of September, 1783, Joseph Montgolfier repeated at Versailles, in presence of the king, the queen, the court and the plebeian spectators, the experiment of Annonay. This time, below the balloon was suspended a cage, containing a sheep, a cock and a duck, emblems of gentleness, self-conceit, and contented mediocrity. They rose 1500 feet, made a voyage of two miles and landed in safety. To them belongs the honor of being the first aerial travellers, but their impressions have not been recorded.

It was soon seen that no real use could be made of the fire-balloon unless some means were employed to feed the fire while in the air. They therefore constructed a light furnace, and laid in a supply of the inevitable straw, but a stoker was yet wanting, until a young naturalist named Francois Pilatre de Rozier, offered his services. He was generously accepted, and after making sundry preliminary experiments with a captive balloon (a balloon held by a rope), he concluded to try a free flight. A friend, the Marquis d'Arlandes accompanied him, the ascent being made on November 21, 1783. They rose 500 feet, and in 25 minutes, having used up all their fuel, descended quietly, at a distance of 25 miles from the starting point.

It was Charles' turn next, and just ten days later he was ready with a new hydrogen balloon, 27 feet in diameter. In company with one of the Roberts, he ascended from Paris, rose to an elevation of 2000 feet,

and after a voyage of two hours descended at Nesle, 27 miles from Paris.

The contest between the two kinds of balloons was now fairly started, and so the next thing in order was to do something gigantic. On January 19, 1784, the largest fire balloon ever made ascended from Lyons. It was over 100 feet in diameter and 130 feet high. Seven persons made the ascent together, among whom was Joseph Montgolfier. They fed the fire as usual with straw, and succeeded in rising to a height of over 3000 feet, but a rent in the upper part of the balloon obliged them to descend sooner than they had intended. This is the only record of an ascent by Joseph Montgolfier, and it is not known that Stephen ever attempted it at all.

Already in 1783 Rittenhouse and Hopkins, of the Philosophical Academy of Philadelphia, had been experimenting on the use of gas for inflating balloons, and finally constructed a machine consisting of 47 small hydrogen balloons, attached to a cage. Jos. Wilcox, a plucky carpenter in their employ, offered to make the ascent. It was a business transaction, and he was careful to secure his pay in advance, because he knew that if he were killed he would not be likely to get it at all. The experiment was quite successful, though the journey was short, for the air-current having changed direction, he found himself approaching the river; so he made incisions in some of the balloons, and effected his descent in safety.

From this time onward many ascents were made in different countries, but after a number of fatal accidents with the fire-balloon, its use was abandoned. The first of these was the death of Rozier himself and of his companion, Romain. Blanchard, a Frenchman, and Jeffries, an American, had crossed the English channel together from Dover to Calais. Rozier intended to cross in the opposite direction from Boulogne to the English coast. To make more certain of sufficient ascensional power, he used both a hydrogen and a fire-balloon, the latter being underneath the former. At a height of 3000 feet, the whole contrivance took fire, and the unlucky adventurers fell on the rocks near the sea-shore and were dashed to pieces. The next victim was Count Zambeccari, an Italian. He was the first to send up a balloon from English ground, in November, 1783. He shortly afterwards returned to his own country where he devoted himself to ballooning, made many ascents, fell twice into the Adriatic Sea, and had several other hair-breadth escapes. Finally, descending in a fire-balloon, in company with Signor Bonaga, September 21, 1812, his grapnel caught in a tree, the shock caused the balloon to take fire, and to save themselves both voyagers leaped to the ground. Bonaga was maimed for life, but Zambeccari was killed on the spot.

Take it all in all the number of serious accidents has not been very great. The number of Englishmen alone, who have made balloon ascents is probably over 2000; we have no record at hand for other countries, but as the original inventors, the French, have adhered to the practise with more persistency than any other people, and as it has been

tried more or less in all countries, the total number of those who have made ascents cannot fall short of 6000 or 7000. Of this number many have ascended hundreds of times. We cannot find an account of more than twenty fatal accidents, and a large percentage of these was due to the fire-balloon or to gross carelessness. With the hydrogen balloon, or its successor, the coal-gas-balloon, accidents have been relatively rare.

What now has been the outcome of all this? To tell the truth, very little. It was thought at the beginning that the air surrounding the earth was only three or four miles deep, and that a balloon might rise to the surface and sail, as a ship on the water. This is why Lana and others fitted sails to their balloons; this is why others again took up oars and rudders. They seemed strangely to forget that men could not live without air, or perhaps they imagined that the ether or their fluid or whatever was up there would supply its place. A hundred years of experience has about convinced the world that a balloon must float *in*, not *on* the atmosphere, and that consequently whatever be its form, be it rigged with sails, or left sailless, be it fitted with a rudder, or left rudderless, it can only drift about at the mercy of every stray wind, and that it can no more be steered than you can steer a cloud.

The results obtained amount to a few haphazard voyages, a few observations on temperatures, a few happy escapes from beleaguered towns, a few attempts to make use of it in military operations, and the inane admiration of gaping crowds on gala days. But as to fulfilling the expectations of those who thought the mastery of the air was already within easy reach, ballooning has proved a sad failure, and we have given up looking for any further real advance in that direction by its means.

If indeed there were some motive power attached to the balloon, capable of giving it a forward motion, independently of the wind, then it might be guided at will. This has been tried and has proved practically useless. In order to have a sufficient ascensional power, a balloon must be very large, and therefore expose such a large surface to the action of the wind, that it would require an enormous power to hold it against even a very moderate breeze. No power known would be of any avail in the case of a high wind, much less in a real storm. This has come to be so generally recognized that balloonists, for some time past, have been trying to devise some better form than the old-fashioned pear-shaped monstrosity. The form which would seem perhaps best suited for the purpose is that of a long cylinder, pointed at the ends, and carrying a car under nearly its whole length. A large, light, propelling screw could be fitted either at the bow or the stern, and rudders arranged for both lateral and vertical steering. A good deal of experimenting has been done in this direction, especially in France, but the results are rather discouraging. The form is indeed much better suited than the old one to independent navigation, but the enormous surface exposed to the wind remains as an insurmountable objection. In a perfectly calm atmosphere it would do pretty well, and indoor experiments, on a small scale, have been successful; but the outside at-

mosphere is rarely calm, and, in our climates at least, is never to be relied on for any length of time. The idea of navigating the air by means of balloons will therefore probably have to be abandoned, and we will probably have to adopt in the end a totally different system.

The one which is now pushing its way to the front is this: to construct a machine of wood and metal, many times heavier than the air, and supplied with a motive power capable of raising the machine and of propelling it onward at the same time. There are reliable indications that it is indeed coming, and its advent may not be so far away as is generally thought.

For some time past two men especially, each eminently qualified for the task, have been thinking and experimenting on the subject, and their results have recently been made public. These are Professor S. P. Langley of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, and the well-known and successful inventor, Hiram S. Maxim. A few words about what they have accomplished will not be out of place here.

Professor Langley did not propose to invent a complete flying machine, but only to determine experimentally how much power would be required to hold up a given weight in the air, by means of a plane propelled forward, and set at a greater or less angle with the horizontal. If this were definitely settled, we could then judge whether or not the art of navigating the air is within the reach of our present means. The experiments were made with great care, and with every necessary attention to detail. They are described in a quarto volume of 115 pages with the aid of a number of large plates and smaller cuts.

In an introductory chapter, Professor Langley says: "These researches have led to the result that mechanical sustentation of heavy bodies in the air, combined with very great speed, is not only possible, but within the reach of mechanical means we actually possess, and while they are not meant to demonstrate the art of guiding such heavy bodies in flight, they do show that we have now the power to sustain and propel them. Further than this, these new experiments (and theory also when reviewed in their light), show that if in such aerial motion, there be given a plane of fixed size and weight, inclined at such an angle, and moved forward at such a speed, that it shall be sustained in horizontal flight, then the more rapid the motion is, the *less* will be the power required to sustain and advance it that is, one horse-power thus employed, will transport a larger weight at 20 miles an hour than at 10, a still larger at 40 miles than at 20 and so on up to some remote limit and not yet attained in experiment." This is a most astonishing assertion; yet there seems to be no doubt but that it has been satisfactorily demonstrated.

The method of experimentation was by means of a gigantic whirling machine, located on the grounds of the Allegheny Observatory, Allegheny, Pa. The machine consists essentially of an upright post about eight feet high, carrying two revolving arms each 30 feet long. These arms are made to revolve horizontally by an underground connection with a steam engine; the speed can be urged to such an extent that the outer ends of the arms will travel at the rate of 100 miles an hour. To

these arms are fixed various attachments, the first of which is called the "suspended plane." This a brass plate, one foot square, and weighing two pounds. It is hung vertically, by a coiled spring, in a guide-frame, in which it is free to move up and down, a measureable distance. Light rollers are arranged so as to render sliding movement as nearly frictionless as possible. The guide-frame itself is pivoted at exactly half its height to two standards, which in turn are fastened to the outer end of the revolving arm. When the arm is at rest, the guide-frame and suspended plane hang vertically, and the spring registers two pounds. When the arm is set in motion and the suspended plane therefore forced forward, the resistance of the air causes the plane to take up a position more or less inclined to the vertical, according as the motion is greater or less, and its position for every rate of speed is registered automatically on a card, by the trace of a pencil point. Under these conditions the "plane" exerts no pressure on the guide-frame, but the whole force, both that due to the weight of the "plane" and that due to the wind of advance, is borne by the spring. One might therefore expect that the spring would be further extended than when at rest. The exact contrary is the fact, the spring being contracted and the contraction being the greater, according as the spread itself is greater. This gives us the first hint that the *greater* the speed, the *less* the power required to maintain a body in horizontal flight, for it must be remembered that the only force which holds up that "suspended plane" and drags it along, is the tension of the spring.

This being satisfactorily settled, another piece of apparatus is introduced. It has been named the "plane dropper," and consists of a rectangular frame about two feet wide by five feet high. It is securely fastened by the middle of one of its longer sides to the outer end of the whirling arm. On the opposite side of this rectangle, a sliding piece of aluminum runs up and down, the friction being eliminated as nearly as possible by delicate ebonite rollers. To this sliding piece are clamped two rectangular planes, one on each side of the upright guide. Their size and weight are accurately determined, and they may be set at any angle with the horizontal from 0° to 45° . All the minute details of the experiment being made ready, the whirling arm is set in motion, with the result that when the speed is sufficiently great, the force of gravity is entirely overcome by the air-pressure on the planes, and they rise along the guide rod. By proper attention and delicate adjustment of the speed of rotation the planes might be made to remain at a given height, neither mounting further nor yet descending. It is found that the speed necessary for this depends on the weight of the planes, on the extent of their surface, on the proportion between their length and width, and on the angle which they make with the horizontal. After a long series of careful experiments had been made and compared together, and many ingenious methods of measuring the various pressures and resistances devised, and every imaginable source of error allowed for, the principal conclusions arrived at are the following:

1. A horizontal plane will fall more slowly in the air, if at the same

time it be endowed with a horizontal motion than if let fall vertically, and this retardation is greater, the greater the horizontal velocity.

2. It requires a greater effort to support a flying machine in the air, when it is at rest relatively to the air, than when it is moving horizontally; and as this horizontal motion becomes greater and greater, the effort needed becomes less and less.

3. It actually requires less power to maintain a high horizontal speed (and support the body) than it does to maintain a less speed.

4. While an engine, developing one horse-power, can transport 200 pounds at the rate of 45 miles an hour, such an engine (boiler and all complete) can now be built to weigh less than one-tenth of that amount. From Prof. Langley's standpoint, then, the outlook for aerial navigation seems remarkably favorable.

We have already trespassed so far on the space allotted to us that we shall be obliged to treat Mr. Maxim's invention very briefly. His own published account consists of only six or seven ordinary pages, exclusive of the illustrations. His method of experimenting has not all the details and fine points of Prof. Langley's, but it is practical and goes straight to the point.

He too erected a whirling arm, to the outer end of which he attached a flying machine, all complete except the engine and boiler. This machine consists of an elongated metal body, through which passes a shaft carrying on its outer end a light screw, somewhat similar in form to the screw of a steamship. Fastened above this is a thin "plane" 12 feet 10 inches long and 2 feet 2 inches wide, the long edge in front. With suitable shafting through the upright post and along the arm, the screw is put in connection with a stationary engine below, and by its revolutions drives itself and the revolving arm around a circumference of 200 feet. Now with this machine and various appliances for measuring the work of the engine, the thrust of the screw, the resistances of friction and pressures, Mr. Maxim finds, just as Prof. Langley did, that the higher the speed, the less would be the power required. He finds, moreover, that one horse-power will support and carry forward from 133 to 250 pounds, according to the speed and the angle which the plane makes with the horizontal, thus confirming Prof. Langley's statements on every point. He concludes from this that if a motor were made to generate one horse-power for every 100 pounds of its own weight, a machine might be made to successfully navigate the air. He next describes a new motor of his own invention which he claims will do much better than that, and he feels almost sure of success, and adds that even if he personally does fail, some one else will succeed, and that the art of navigating the air will be an accomplished fact within the next ten years. The way seems pretty clear ahead, and, old as we are, we hope by behaving well, to live to see *the* dream of a lifetime come true.

NOTES.

1. *A New Diving Dress* has lately been invented and patented in England by Col. W. Carey, which has several points of superiority over those heretofore in use. Garments for the use of divers, though protecting the body perfectly from contact with the water, do not protect it from the pressure which the water exerts, and this pressure, even at moderate depths, is not only a great inconvenience, but may result sooner or later in positive injury. The dress designed by Col. Carey is intended to resist this pressure, being however sufficiently flexible at the joints to allow perfect freedom of movement. It has besides, buoyancy enough not only to carry its own weight, but also that of the diver, who is therefore obliged to be weighted in order to sink and remain below. This at first sight might look like a disadvantage, yet such is not the case. It is a decided advantage, since it renders the diver less dependent on aid from above. In case of danger from whatever cause he can slip the weight and rise to the surface, without waiting to signal his desire to be hauled up. The new garment has been named the "Crustacean Dress," being, as it were, an imitation of the every-day, working clothes of the crab, the lobster and such things. If ever we engage in the diving business we shall certainly take care to be provided with the new dress, and we advise our friends to do likewise.

2. *A Monster Pumping-Engine* has lately been completed and tested in Omaha, Nebraska. It has satisfactorily fulfilled the promises made for it of pumping 18,000,000 gallons a day, against a head of 310 feet. The stroke of the piston is five feet, the total height of the machine fifty-three feet; it weighs 1100 tons, and cost \$150,000, a pretty respectable price, and more than most people would care to pay for a mere pump. Omaha ought to be satisfied now, one would think. She has, besides the machine just mentioned, a "Holly" pumping engine, capable of delivering 14,000,000 gallons daily. With a population of about 140,000 she manages to use up 16,000,000 gallons of water (the amount of other liquids not stated) every twenty-four hours, which amounts to nearly 115 gallons on an average for each individual. Her two engines are capable of delivering just twice that quantity, so there is little danger of scarcity "as long as the river flows," the muddy Missouri, to wit. Speaking of the Missouri reminds us that before being fit for use all this water has to undergo a thorough system of purification. The magnitude of this part of the work will be understood when it is remembered that each day's supply carries with it 100,000 pounds of mud, all of which has to be extracted before the water is delivered to the city mains, and it is done successfully.

Water is a great blessing when it gets its legitimate use; in fact, the degree of civilization of a country might be gauged almost to a nicety by the amount of water used for lavatory purposes. The Great Unwashed never accomplished anything permanent in the history of the race, and we congratulate Omaha that she has recognized this fact, and given her citizens the means of taking another long stride onward and upward.

The Omaha Pumping Engine was designed by Mr. Irving H. Reynolds, a promising engineer, not yet 30 years of age. On the occasion of the public trial of the engine, the good people of the city gave him a grand ovation in the grand western way, and after talking and shouting themselves hoarse over water and pumps in general, and Omaha water and pumps in particular, they vociferously called on Mr. Reynolds to make a speech. He did so and his harangue which was justly considered the most eloquent one of the occasion we give entire. "The Engine speaks for itself; I have nothing to add."

3. It is announced that a great government work has been completed, that is, the survey of the Pacific Coast of the United States. As all the navigable waters of the country belong to the general government, the work of the survey naturally devolved on Federal engineers and officers. There is every reason to believe then that the work has been done as carefully and thoroughly as its importance demands. This means that our whole coast line on the Pacific, with its all its bays and inlets and harbors, has been carefully measured and mapped out; that the latitude and longitude at every point have been determined, as well as the positions of headlands, bluffs, rocks, shoals and islands. The ocean bed itself plotted by soundings extending from low water mark to a sufficient distance beyond the outmost rocks and shoals, and incidentally the character of the bottom, whether muddy, sandy or rocky, noted. This may all be commonplace enough, but it has called for a good deal of patience, perseverance and skill.

Nearly a whole generation has been swept away and a new one has come to take its place since this work was begun, just twenty years ago, but the results will endure for the benefit of many a generation yet unborn.

The great naturalist, Agassiz, was on board the first steamer, the *Hassler*, engaged in this work, and was afforded an opportunity to make a systematic series of deep-sea dredgings all along the coast of South as well as North America, a work which, perhaps more than any other has contributed much to our knowledge of the deep-sea fauna of the Pacific.

The recent surveys have brought to light one fact not generally known, viz., that at Southern California the coast is much more abrupt than at any other portion of North America. At a distance of a mile or even less from the shore, the depth of the water has been found to be fully 600 feet, whereas this depth is reached at other points of the Atlantic and Pacific coast only at a distance of from 25 to 100 miles off shore. This was not known when we first conned our lessons in geography, and so, one by one the idols of our youth are broken.

4. According to the latest scientific journals, another smokeless powder has just been invented which claims to be the best yet invented. It comes from Sweden as a black shining powder with prismatic grains; it has been named *apryrite*. It has been subjected to severe tests by Swedish engineers, and their report is exceedingly favorable. Among other things, it may be heated with safety to a temperature at which other

smokeless powders would be dangerous, or which would at least be injurious to the qualities of the powders themselves. This property renders it very valuable for use in rapid-firing machine guns, which necessarily become very hot in action. It does not tend to cake when stored in large quantities, and this too is an especially good point. In firing it heats the gun-barrels much less than ordinary gunpowder, and very much less than nitro-glycerine powder. It does not foul the piece to any serious extent in firing, nor does it cause corrosion when the barrel is left for a long time uncleaned. Percussion will not cause it to explode. The exact composition is of course kept as secret as possible, but it seems to be a species of nitro-cellulose containing a large proportion of nitrogen. It is said to give high initial velocities with moderate pressures. If all these claims are substantiated in use, *apryrite* will be a valuable addition to the arguments of fighting peoples, and a dangerous rival to all other explosive powders in use.

5. We were told long, long ago, that frogs were "amphibious," and we made then and there a mental picture of that word in connection with "frog." Whenever we meet a frog we see it again, so that it is easy to recall it now. The word, all jointed like a museum skeleton, not frog colored, but white, seemed to be standing near the little brook, and when we said "Shoo!" it swayed backwards and forwards a few times and then, turning a complete somersault, fell into the brook and disappeared. After a few seconds, however, it reappeared near the opposite side, this time all frog, color, croak and everything, the mild and sly, but cautious wink included. Then began our first study of the laws of projectiles. Ah!

When therefore we read recently that a Frenchman, of Marseilles, had invented an amphibious velocipede, it is not strange that the old image came back, and that the frog, the Frenchman, the "amphibious" and the velocipede got somewhat mixed. We are going to try to disentangle them.

As you have guessed, the machine is intended for both land and water travel. It differs from an ordinary velocipede in this that the wheels, instead of being made with spokes, are short hollow cylinders. When the machine enters the water, the wheels by their buoyancy, support it together with the rider. Attached to the sides of the wheels are copper paddles which serve as propellers, and with these a fairly active man is said to be capable of making from three to four miles an hour. With improvements contemplated in the size and form of the paddles it is expected that a speed of about six miles an hour will be obtained. How the machine is to be steered and kept on an even keel is not stated, though there should not be much difficulty about that. It has already been found useful for the rescue of persons from drowning.

On the land it will naturally appear somewhat ungainly, as water-fowl generally do, yet it is reported as making very good speed, and taking it on a mixed run, land and water included, it would be far more useful than any mere land craft. Success to the "amphibious velocipede."

6. Now that the winter is upon us it is at least a consolation to know that an efficient machine has been invented for keeping our electric railroad tracks clear of snow. According to the *Engineering Magazine* an electric snow-sweeper, that is to say, a snow-sweeper driven by an electric motor, has been put upon the market by a manufacturing company in St. Paul, Minn. A feature of this sweeper is, that while the machine is driven along the track of an electric railway by a motor of 30 horse-power, taking its current through the trolley wire, the two sweeping brushes are each driven by an independent motor, and all the three motors are reversible. It is stated that this plow is competent to remove from a track snow having a depth of from three to twelve inches, while running at a speed of from four to ten miles an hour. The independent action of the brush motors enables them, when necessary, to be run at a high speed while the plow is moved slowly along the track, and thus to cut away hard, compacted snow, or drifts. It is stated that this machine was thoroughly tested last winter and its effectiveness thereby completely demonstrated.

The next thing in order would be to give us an effective machine to keep the streets of our eastern cities clean in summer.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

L'EVANGÉLISATION DE L'AMÉRIQUE AVANT CHRISTOPHE COLOMB. Par *M. le Dr. Luka Jelić*. Paris. Alphonse Picard, 82 Rue Bonaparte : Paris. 1891.

This is an essay that was read at one of the sessions of the International Scientific Congress of Catholics, held in Paris, from the 1st to the 6th of last April.

After stating the ancient tradition concerning the existence of a continent beyond the Atlantic Ocean—a tradition of the Egyptians, of the Greeks, and of the Middle Ages—the author speaks of the voyage of St. Brandan and his Irish monks in the sixth century in search of a continent beyond the Atlantic Ocean; of the unsuccessful efforts made afterwards to rediscover these transatlantic islands, which are mentioned by Honorius of Autun (1112–1137), and by Gervaise of Tilbury (1211), the geographers, and found on the maps of the Middle Ages; he shows that the continent of America was colonized by the Northmen at the beginning of the tenth century. The Scandinavian Sagas prove that Greenland was known to the Northmen from Norway at the end of the ninth, and was colonized by them before the end of the tenth century; that Hilluland, Markland, Vineland, and Hvíttramannaland, were colonized in the eleventh century, and these countries were converted to Christianity at that time. He confines his history of Christianity in America, before Columbus, to the history of the diocese of Gardar, which comprised Greenland and the northeastern part of America.

The Scandinavian Sagas attribute the discovery and colonization of Greenland to the Northmen Gunnbjorn (887), and Eric the Red (983); the discovery and colonization of the coasts of northeast America to Bjarn Heriulfson (986), and Leif the Lucky (1001). The Sagas tell us, that the conversion of Greenland to Christianity was due to St. Olaf, the Great, king of Norway (1015–1030). This testimony of the Sagas is confirmed by a Bull of Pope Nicholas V., of the date 1448, in which he speaks of the existing tradition to that effect, which had been communicated to him by the Greenlanders themselves. Our author gives a copy of this Bull in his Appendix.

As to the date of the introduction of Christianity on the American continent, we have only vague indications. In 1050, the Saxon bishop Jason went as far as Vineland, and suffered martyrdom there. In 1112 or 1113, Eric-Upsi an Irishman, was consecrated bishop for America, and preached the gospel to the natives of the continent. In 1121, he went to Vineland, and determined not to return to Greenland, in order to give his entire attention to the evangelization of this new country. As to the success of his work, the Vatican archives give abundant testimony in the reports made to Rome of the collections of Peter Pence taken up by the bishop in the diocese of Gardar; for such collections were based on the number of families, and therefore in 1327 there must have been at least one thousand Catholic families in the diocese, judging from the report made to Rome for that year. Another proof is contained in the letters of Christian Le Clerq, a missionary for twelve years amongst the Indians of Gaspésie (in our day Acadia and Nova Scotia) in the seventeenth century; he speaks of the tribe called "Porte Croix," of their traditions taken from the Bible; of their prayer, which was a corruption of the "Our Father"; of the Cross, the venerated object

of their worship, placed by them on their graves, worn on their dress, cut on their furniture.

The colonies of Greenland, by a regulation of Benedict IX. (1044), were subject to the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, which comprised all the northeru countries of Europe; they were under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishop of Iceland. After Eric-Upsi had decided to remain in Vineland, and not to return to Greenland, the colonists then held a diet, in 1123, and petitioned that Greenland might be erected into an episcopal see. Not having the requisite number of inhabitants to constitute a diocese, still, by reason of its distance from Europe, the petition was granted. The first bishop, Arnold, was chosen in 1124, consecrated by the Archbishop of Lund, and fixed his see at Gardar, in 1126. For some years the new see remained subject to the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen.

When the ecclesiastical province of Norway was established, in 1148, by Pope Eugene III., Gardar was attached to it as one of its suffragan sees, the province being that of Drontheim; and thus we find from the middle of the twelfth century, the diocese of Gardar always mentioned in the *Provinciale Vetus* of Albinus, 1183, in the *Liber censuum* of Cencius Camerarius, 1192, and, later on, in the *Libri Taxarum*.

The preaching of the Crusades, and the collections taken up by the Popes all over Christendom, in furtherance of that object, after the second half of the thirteenth century, furnish us with many documents concerning this diocese of Gardar. In 1261, the Norwegian bishop, Olaf, induced the Greenlanders to contribute both men and money to the deliverance of the Holy Land, and from that time we have frequent notices of the collection of the tithes and Peter Pence. In 1276, the Archbishop of Drontheim, who had been appointed the official collector of the Holy See, petitioned Pope John XXI. to be dispensed from taking up the collection in Gardar, affirming that it would take him five years to fulfil that mission. In 1279, Pope Nicholas III. gave the archbishop extraordinary powers to delegate clerics to take up such collections in the diocese of Gardar. From a Bull of Martin IV., in 1282, we know that the Peter Pence was paid in hides of cattle, seal skins, and whales' teeth, which was exchanged for money in Norway. These cattle-hides must have come from the continent further south.

After the Council of Vienne, 1311, a general collection was ordered, and the bishop of Gardar, Arnius, returned to his see, in 1315, to take it up. From that date down to 1418, we have frequent mention of the diocese of Gardar, and from the increase of the collection, as given in the fiscal books of the Holy See, we can judge of the increase of its Catholic population.

In 1418, Greenland was invaded by savages from the American continent, who pillaged and burnt all its towns and made captives of its inhabitants. Only nine churches, in the interior, escaped destruction. Thirty years after, the Greenlanders managed to return to their native land, rebuilt as best they could some of their churches, and begged of Pope Nicholas V. to send them a bishop and some priests to care for their souls. They informed the Pope of the destruction of their homes, the massacre of their priests, and the sufferings they had endured for thirty years in captivity on the continent. The Pope listened to their prayers, and in 1448 commanded the bishop of Holar and Skalholt to restore religion in Greenland; but, for unknown reasons, the Pope's decision was not carried out. Fifty years elapsed, when the Greenlanders renewed their petition for spiritual aid to Pope Innocent VIII. Their situation was most deplorable. Abandoned to themselves for

almost a century, without bishops, without priests to instruct them, without the Sacraments, they had almost forgotten the faith of their fathers. The only memorial of that faith which they had been able to preserve, was a corporal, which was every year exposed publicly for the veneration of the people; on that corporal, a hundred years before, the last priest in Greenland had consecrated the Body and Blood of our Lord. Moved by their touching appeal, Alexander VI., who had succeeded Innocent VIII., sent to the see of Gardar, Matthias, a Benedictine, who had been made bishop by his predecessor. He was a man filled with holy zeal for the salvation of the poor Greenlanders. This was the very year that hailed with wonder the news of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus (1492).

We have given a very full digest of this interesting pamphlet. It is enriched by numerous citations from historical documents and manuscripts, and, as an appendix, gives besides the list of the archepiscopal province of Norway, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, the Bulls of Pope Nicholas V. and Alexander VI. concerning the re-establishment of the diocese of Gardar in Greenland.

THE LIFE OF FATHER HECKER. By *Rev. Walter Elliott*. New York: The Columbus Press, 1891.

A life of Father Hecker, and by Father Elliott, a person so eminently, so peculiarly qualified—alike from his long and intimate association with the subject of the work, and by his acknowledged ability—needs no words of commendation. In his all too modest preface to the work Father Elliott tells us that his words are but the “hinges and latches” of the doors of the edifice built of Father Hecker’s journals, letters and recorded sayings. But he has done his work well and done it with a strength and clearness and honesty that makes it of far more than home-made quality. We are glad he has given so much space to the letters and recorded sayings of Father Hecker; for, after all, it is the truest form of biography. In one’s letters and sayings we see him as he was and not as he seemed to some well meaning but unreasoning admirer.

Few men of his generation held so unique a place in the thoughts and affections of both priests and people as did Father Hecker, a thing all the more to be wondered at when we consider the little promise of future greatness offered by his first beginnings in the priesthood. Long years before his death his name was a household word throughout the land—the synonym for priestly zeal, for breadth of thought, for intensest loyalty to the Holy See, for clearest understanding of the times and their needs. To the thousands who knew and loved Father Hecker, and to the other thousands who had come to know him from his writings, it will surely be the sweetest pleasure to read Father Elliott’s life of him. And what a life it was! From the beginning, from youngest manhood, earnest, high-principled and thoughtful; at an age, too, when most young men have not a thought for the serious wrestling with problems and thoughts of the gravest and most far reaching import. “He has said that often at night, when lying on the shavings before the oven in the bake-house, he would start up, roused in spite of himself by some great thought, and run out upon the wharves to look at the East river in the moonlight, or wander about under the spell of some restless aspiration. What does God desire from me? How shall I attain unto Him? What is it He has sent me into the world to do? These were the ceaseless questions of a heart that rested, meanwhile, in an unshaken confidence that time would bring the answer.”

Imagine him—as Father Elliott tells us—“Kneading at the dough-trough with Kant’s ‘Critique of Pure Reason’ fastened up on the wall before him, so that he might lose no time in merely manual labor. Fichte and Hegel succeeded Kant, all of them philosophers whose mother tongue was likewise his own and whose combined influence put him farther off than ever from the solution of that fundamental doubt, which constantly grew more perplexing and more painful. We find him (a young man) hiring a seat in the Unitarian Church of the Messiah where Orville Duvey was then preaching and walking every Sunday a distance of three miles from the foot of Rutgers street, “because he was a smart fellow and I enjoyed listening to him.” “Did I believe in Unitarianism? No; I believed in nothing.” All this, and in years but yet a boy. And but little more than a boy in years was he, when we find him joining that famous but short-lived community at Brook Farm. In a little while we see him at Fruitlands under the tutorship of Amos Bronson Alcott. Then in turn Pantheism, subjectivism, idealism, philanthropy were tried. “Theoretically and practically, Isaac Hecker loved humanity; to make men happy was his ever-renewed endeavor; was, in truth, the condition on which his own happiness depended. For years, this view of his life-task alternated with his search for exact answers to the questions his soul asked about man’s destiny hereafter; or, one might rather say, social questions and philosophical ones borrowed strength from each other to assail him till his heart throbbed and his brain whirled with the agony of the conflict.”

One by one he examined the Protestant sects, but in none of them did he find what his soul sought, “Not having had”—he wrote in the *Catholic World* for November, 1887—“personal and experimental knowledge of the Protestant denominations, I investigated them all, going from one of them to another—Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and all—conferring with their ministers and reading their books. It was a dreary business, but I did it. I knew transcendentalism well, and had been a radical socialist. All was found to be as above stated. Bronson’s ripe experience and my own thoroughly earnest investigation tallied perfectly. Indeed, the more you examine the Protestant sects in the light of first principles, the more they are found to weaken human certitude, interfere with reason’s native knowledge of God and His attributes, and perplex the free working of the laws of human thought. Protestantism is no religion for a philosopher, unless he is a pessimist—if you call such a being a philosopher—and adopts Calvinism.”

It was a toilsome journey, hardly to be appreciated by those of us born in the faith. But directed by his unerring instinct for the truth and aided by the ripe experience and masterly intellect of Bronson, who was linked to him by the closest bond of friendship, Father Hecker drew nearer step by step to the Church of Christ. “Do you really believe the Gospel?” about this time Bronson writes to him. “Do you really believe the Holy Catholic Church? If so, you must put yourself under the protection of the Church. I have commenced my preparations for uniting myself with the Catholic Church. I do not as yet belong to the family of Christ, I feel it, I can be an alien no longer, and without the Church I know, by my own past experience, that I cannot attain to purity and sanctity of life. I need the counsels, the aids, the chastisements and the consolations of the Church. It is the appointed medium of salvation, and how can we hope for any good except through it?”

Of his entrance into the Church, of his subsequent trials, of his stu-

dent life, of his ordination and subsequent magnificent work as a priest, Father Elliott's work tells us clearly and beautifully. As a Paulist, he set himself a great and noble task. He has laid the foundation broad and deep, and the good work we are sure will go on. All that Archbishop Ireland says in his splendid and manly introduction, it gives us great pleasure to indorse.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL AND OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES; consisting of an Introduction to each Epistle, an Analysis of each Chapter, a Paraphrase of the Sacred Text, and a Commentary, embracing Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Dogmatical, interspersed with moral reflections. By His Grace the *Most Rev. John MacEvilly, D.D.*, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1891. Benziger Brothers, Broadway, New York.

This Work has already passed through three large editions. It has also received the approval, successively of Popes Pius IX., and Leo XIII. The late Cardinal Wiseman expressed his opinion of it in terms of high commendation, as the following extract from his letter, shows:

"I have delayed acknowledging the receipt of the Work till . . . I could make myself acquainted with its contents. I have been able to do so to-day, and can, therefore, with better grace, thank you not merely for two elegant volumes, but for a solidly useful book. You have conferred a real, substantial benefit, not only on students in divinity, but on all Catholics speaking the English tongue. Your method is clear and complete, and you render the Sacred Text of a most difficult portion of Sacred Scripture intelligible where difficult, and practical where plain, so as to make its reading doubly profitable to learned and unlearned. I therefore, congratulate you most sincerely, for having undertaken and executed so good a work, and beg you to continue your useful and edifying labors."

The late illustrious Archbishop McHale wrote of it as follows:

"Together with a judicious Paraphrase of the Sacred Text, it embraces a full and satisfactory elucidation of its sense, and the varied Commentary, selected from the best interpreters of these Epistles, is interspersed with copious moral reflections.

"Such a work—useful to Clergy and Laity—has been hitherto much wanted in the English language; and, aware of the mass of valuable information which the writer's talents, industry and familiarity with Biblical learning, have enabled him to diffuse through its pages, we feel much satisfaction in giving our sanction for its publication."

Such high and emphatic terms of commendation, setting forth so distinctly the characteristic features of the Work, and by such distinguished scholars, render needless any special commendation on our part. Accordingly, we turn our attention, rather, to a brief exposition of the plan and method of the Work.

The *plan* which the learned author has adopted, is that of the well-known commentary of Piconio, on the Epistles of St. Paul. Piconio's commentary, it is needless to say to scholarly students of Sacred Scripture, is confined to the Epistles of St. Paul and does not extend to the Catholic Epistles, which are included in this Work. Yet, it is well here to say, that in following the *plan* of Piconio, the author has not borrowed from him more than he has done from other learned commentators to whom he refers, from time to time, throughout his Work.

The *Text* is taken from the edition published by Duffy, Dublin, 1857, with the approval and under the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. The author has carefully collated this text with that of the

Clementine Vulgate, with which he says it is "perfectly conformable, with some unimportant verbal exceptions," which he has corrected or mentioned in his Commentary.

In the PARAPHRASE, besides expressing the meaning of the text, the author points out the connection of the several parts, a task of no small difficulty, particularly as regards the Epistles of St. Paul, as every student of those Epistles well knows.

In the COMMENTARY, the author vindicates the correctness of his interpretation of his explanations of the connection, given in his Paraphrase. Before entering on the elucidation of the several words and phrases of the Sacred Text, he notices any differences of reading that exist between the Vulgate and the ordinary or received Greek Text, and points out the preponderance of authorities, both as regards the ancient Fathers and chief manuscripts, in favor of the Vulgate. In the quotations from the Old Testament, which are in many instances, according to the Septuagint—the version then principally in use—the author points out the differences of reading between it and the Vulgate, of the same Texts as translated or corrected by St. Jerome.

Though the learned author's chief object, as he notes it in his admirable Preface, is to elucidate the meaning of the Sacred Text, and to point out the doctrinal bearing of the several passages, yet as regards their *critical* portion, there is enough to satisfy the careful reader, that as regards this, the rules of sound Biblical criticism have been judiciously applied.

We warmly commend this Work as (to adopt the words of the late illustrious John, Archbishop of Tuam) "highly useful both to Clergy and Laity, and hitherto much wanted in the English language." Along with the learned writer's commentaries on the Gospels according to Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, it furnishes a commentary upon almost the entire New Testament.

LA DOTTRINA DEL SIGNORE. Pei dodici Apostoli bandita alle genti, detta La Dottrina Dei Dodici Apostoli, versione note e commentario del *P. Ignazio M. Minasi*, D.C. D.G. Roma. Tipografia, A. Befana, 1891.

The diligent search that is being made of the libraries of the monasteries in the East, and the study of the manuscripts stored away among their treasures, are bringing to light constantly the most valuable documents hitherto unknown to the students of history and theology.

In the year 1883 Archbishop Philotheos Bryennios published a manuscript which he had discovered in the library of the Jerusalem Monastery at Constantinople. It formed a part of a collection which had been transcribed by a notary named Leo in 1056, who writes at the end of the work that he finished his task on Tuesday the 11th of June, 1056. The collection was made up of seven small works—all important—but there was one which had heretofore been wholly unknown to the world of letters. It was the fifth of the collection and entitled *διδασχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, otherwise, the Doctrine of the Lord promulgated by the Twelve Apostles to the nations. It was described under the first title by Archbishop Bryennios as far back as 1875. In 1889, Rev. Dr. Schaff published an English edition of the work, in which he gives a long list of authors who have written commentaries on the text and what each writer has furnished for its proper explanation. The work is valuable as throwing light on the New Testament and giving us a better idea of the constitution of the primitive Church.

In 1884 Scribner's Sons, of New York, published the text of the

"Teaching" edited with a translation, introduction, and notes by Roswell D. Hitchcock and Francis Brown, Professors in Union Theological Seminary. In their introduction, they declare the document genuine. It is cited by Clement of Alexandria, by Eusebius and Athanasius. It had been recognized by the learned that there must have been some document underlying both the Seventh Book of the "Apostolic Constitutions" and the "Apostolic Epitome." They attribute the work probably as far back as 120 A.D. They congratulate themselves on being able to present the work so promptly to the American public.

In his introduction the author speaks of the liturgical language of the Hellenist Jews; of the old paraphrases of this work and the citations made from it by the Fathers of the Church. He examines the question as to the date of its composition and concludes that it must have been written after the Gospel of St. Matthew, and before the others had been published and that the Apostles were its authors.

Our author publishes also the celebrated Hymn of Abercius, which he attributes to the middle of the second century, and the Christian Sacrifice described by the martyr, St. Justin, in order to show that the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles must be a more ancient work than either.

He gives us the text in Greek, with an Italian translation, enriched by copious notes. His commentary on the text takes up nearly two hundred and twenty-five pages. As an appendix the author gives a complete dictionary of all the Greek words used in the "Doctrine" with a full explanation of their meaning; an index of Scriptural citations; a general index of all the chapters and a special index *rerum*, so invaluable for every work which must be frequently consulted. Our author considers it entirely unnecessary to prove that such ancient documents as the Letter attributed to Barnabas, the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions and the Ecclesiastical Canons after the *praecepta dominica*, are simply paraphrases of this "Doctrine," and as being of much later date, must be used with caution in interpreting the same, because they were adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the times.

It is necessary to read and study the learned commentary of the author to understand what a flood of light is thrown on the manners and customs of the primitive Church, the prescribed fasts and prayers, the recognition of the first day of the week, called the Lord's day, the necessity of confession, the meaning of the phrase "breaking of bread," the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the origin of the Doxology, the character of the Liturgy, who could be present thereat, the choice of Bishops and Deacons. In the last chapter of the commentary the author shows that all the citations of the "Doctrine" are taken from the Gospel of St. Matthew: that it is always called *the* Gospel; he answers the objections that might be urged that there are in the "Doctrine" certain allusions to texts taken from the Gospel of St. Luke; and his conclusion is that the work must therefore have been written almost immediately after the Gospel of St. Matthew. Theological students and all lovers of Church history must thank Father Minasi for the publication of this learned and exhaustive treatise.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR. By *Edwin Carl Bissel*, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. The Hartford Theological Seminary, 1891, pp. ix., 134, price, \$1.75.

Hebrew is generally regarded by those uninitiated in Semitic languages as a very difficult study. Its weird characters and peculiar structure, so

different from that of Western tongues, give it an air of mystery. Yet a little insight into its principles and material shows that it is, if not the easiest, certainly one of the easiest of languages to master. Its difficulty is trifling compared with that of Greek, Latin or German. Grammarians, however, seem to make it as hard to enter as the tomb of Abraham, over which the Moslem keeps such jealous watch and ward. Let the student who would not be repelled from making acquaintance with the sacred language, avoid at the start Gesenius, or any of his recent German and English editors. These will do to clear up many a point after he has gained some facility in reading the Old Testament. If he knows Latin he will find, we believe, no better, clearer, simpler guide than Slaughter's "*Grammatica Hebraica*" as amended by Castellini, *quondam* professor of Arabic in the Roman College, and still later revised by Bargès, professor of Hebrew in the Paris Academy; published by Maisonneuve. Mons. Corcoran, no mean authority on this subject, thought very highly of this as an introductory grammar. He used it for many years as a text in his classes, and was wont in playful way to style it *beata illa Grammatica*. Next to it the beginner will find Chabot's "*Grammaire Hébraïque Élémentaire*" (3d edition), or Senepin's book with the same French title. or Dr. Gabriel's English translation of Vosen-Kaulen's "*Rudiments*," of excellent service. These three are published by Herder, St. Louis. They are simple and sufficiently full to introduce the student to easy translation of the Old Testament.

Midway between these elementary books, and the more erudite treatises, based on Gesenius, we would place the admirable work of Professor Bissel. Fuller in detail than the former, it is less intricate than the latter. It is eminently what it claims to be—a *practical* grammar. Its completeness, yet compactness of material, with its apparatus of exercises, vocabularies, notes, illustrations, references; its perfect method; its accuracy and neatness of print, make it a model text for the classroom. Especially praiseworthy is the make-up of its vocabularies, which comprise the words most frequently used in the Hebrew Bible. "All words used in the Hebrew Bible over fifty times, the most of those used between twenty-five and fifty times, and not a few of those, of connected roots, used less than twenty-five times, are here found, and they are the only Hebrew words employed in the book." (b. I.). The rules and principles of the grammar are so made to bear on this important vocabulary that the pupil, whilst learning theory, is ever reducing it to practice, and is at the same time storing in memory the words which will introduce him to early and easy reading of the Old Testament. Moreover, by a unique disposition of the vocabulary, he is helped to a fair insight into Hebrew etymology and synonymy. Professor Bissel's grammar is introductory only in a qualified sense. For students who have mastered a more elementary book, it will be aptly introductory to a more extended, more scientific work. In the hands of a master like its author it will doubtless answer even for beginners. But for private study or for use by a less skilled teacher, a simpler grammar we think were desirable. This we judge from a comparison between it and the books mentioned above, on the classification and changes of the vowel points, on the prefixes, and on the verb. Still, the value of an introductory grammar must be judged by the point first to be gained. If the aim be to equip the student as quickly as possible with the essentials of a language and then send him to grow into its spirit by the use of dictionary and reference grammar—and this is our standard—the easier and simpler, if adequate to the purpose, the better the introductory book. If, on the other hand, the aim be to strengthen the pupil with a more

thorough grasp of the detailed structure of a language before entering at large on the work of constant translation, then we doubt if there can be found a more available grammar than the one before us.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS per modum conferentiarum, auctore clarissimo. *P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F.* Novis curis edidit *P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O. S. F.* Paderbonæ. 1891, Ex Typographia Bonifaciana. Benziger Bros. New York. Four parts, I., II., III., IV.

Father Benjamin Elbel of the Order of Friars Minor died June 4, 1756. His "Moral Conferences, or Moral Theology," proposed in the form of practical cases, passed through many editions even during the author's life-time—an excellent sign of its worth and popularity. Father Bierbaum takes as the text of the present work, the fifth edition as revised and amended by Elbel himself in 1751. He publishes it entire, although in some cases, the changes which have taken place in the civil law, make such parts useful only as illustrations of the doctrines proposed. Such solutions of cases as have been modified by recent decisions of the Apostolic See are all noted and corrected, the correction being marked in the text by an asterisk preceding and following such correction. He has carefully verified all the citations from other authors made by Elbel, and quotes the editions of those authors which he has so examined.

Although this "Moral Theology" is proposed in the form of conferences or practical cases, it must not be inferred that he neglects the full explanation of all the principles of Moral Science. These principles are clearly and scientifically set forth at the beginning of each chapter. Then follow a number of cases in which we behold the application of such principles.

Who that has studied Moral Theology in the pages of Voit, a textbook in common use some fifty years ago, has not been charmed with the cases proposed? Voit did but follow in the footsteps of Elbel.

As to the rank of Elbel as a moral theologian it is enough for us to say that St. Alphonsus makes most frequent use of his authority in his theology.

Gury says of him in his "Commentary on Moral Theologians:" "he excels in sound and clean-cut doctrine and in the explanation and solution of practical cases" Müller says "he excels in soundness of doctrine and in copious practical cases." Hurter, that "he is a weighty authority on morals and a probabilist;" and Lehmkuhl, whose opinion is of the highest authority, affirms that "he deserves to be numbered amongst the classic and principal writers on Moral Theology."

Clear, practical and scientific—these are the chief merits of the work, and the syllogistic form in which most of the solutions are given adds a special grace for the student.

Part I. is on human acts, conscience, law and sin. Part II. on faith, hope, charity and religion. Part III. on the second, third and fourth precepts of the Decalogue, and the first three precepts of the Church. These three parts form the first volume. Part IV. comprises the last six precepts of the Decalogue.

The work is printed on excellent paper, and with fine type, a credit to the publisher. Our readers will thank us for calling their attention to this new edition of an author they have seen so often quoted, but whose work has long since been out of print and almost inaccessible to the theological student. Vives gave us a reprint of Lacroix some years ago. We are grateful to Father Bierbaum for this reprint of Elbel.

DIE SENTENZEN ROLANDS, nachmals Papstes Alexander III., zum ersten Male herausgegeben von *P. Fr. Ambrosius M. Gietl, O. Pr.* Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. \$3.20.

A valuable contribution to the history of dogma. In his preface, Father Gietl declares that the discovery of this precious manuscript, now published for the first time, is due to Father Henry Denifle, sub-archivist of the Holy See. The labor inseparable from its publication, the verification of the many citations, was undertaken at his instigation. For a proper appreciation of these Sentences of Roland, the author was forced to introduce much of the theology of that period, especially the teaching of Abelard and Omnibene. We may say, that these Sentences of Roland, with those of Peter Lombard, led up to and found their perfection and fitting conclusion in the "Summa" of St. Thomas.

In a learned introduction of sixty-five pages, the author proves, from extrinsic and intrinsic reasons, that the writer of these Sentences can be no other than Rolandus Bandinellus, who, in 1159, became Pope under the name of Alexander III.; that they were, most probably, written by him after his elevation to the cardinalate, and before he became Chancellor of the Holy See, therefore, about the year 1150; he treats of the theology of Roland, and that of Abelard, of Hugo of St. Victor, and of Omnibene; of Roland's method of teaching in general, but especially on the Sacrament of Matrimony; in conclusion, he shows that the manuscript belongs to the thirteenth century, and gives a minute description of the same.

The text of the Sentences, with explanatory notes of the author, takes up three hundred and twenty-two pages, and embraces the whole field of theology, with the exception of the Sacrament of Orders and *de novissimis*. The most subtle and curious questions are asked in each treatise, then answered, and objections urged and refuted. For one unacquainted with the writings of the old scholastics, these Sentences of Roland, showing as they do the style of teaching theology in the middle ages, must be both interesting and most instructive. It is clear that Roland did not make use of the Sentences of the great master, Peter Lombard, whose work must have appeared at about the same time. The learned world will be grateful to Father Gietl for this valuable publication.

EIN CYCLUS CHRISTOLOGISCHER GEMÄLDE, aus der Katakombe der Heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus zum erstenmal herausgegeben und erläutert. Von *Joseph Wilpert*, mit 9 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. \$3.30.

Only a few months ago we called the attention of our readers to the superb work of Joseph Wilpert on the Paintings of the Catacombs and their old copies. Now this diligent disciple of de Rossi gives us another royal work on the paintings of our Divine Lord found in the Catacombs of SS. Peter and Marcellinus. He takes the paintings found in room 54 of these Catacombs, those of the ceiling and walls, viz., the Star, the Annunciation of the Archangel to Mary and the Three Magi on the ceiling; and the cures of the woman with the bloody flux, of the man with dropsy, of the man born blind, of the leper, and Christ and the Samaritan woman at the well.

He gives a full explanation of all these paintings, showing us what wonderful things lie hidden in the Catacombs of Rome awaiting the diligent explorer and student.

He adds a chapter on the end or intention of the Catacomb paintings

and principally on the remembrance of and prayers for the dead. We will give only one of those quoted by Wilpert from the end of the second or beginning of the third century.

Vos Precor O Fratres. Orare Huc Quando Venitis.
Et Precibus. Totis. Patrem. Natumque Rogatis.
Sit. Vestrae. Mentis. Agapes. Carae. Meminisse.
Ut Deus. Omnipotens. Agapen In Saecula Servet.

"Brethren, when you come here to pray and in the common prayer call on the Father and the Son, I beseech you remember dear Agape that Almighty God may preserve Agape forever."

It makes one's heart rejoice to go over such works as this, and Herder brings them out in a style worthy of the subject and the paintings. Print and illustrations are truly magnificent.

We are sure that Wilpert will give us more of his invaluable studies of the Catacombs and Herder should receive every encouragement as the publisher of these editions.

DON GABRIEL GARCIA MORENO, PRAESIDENT DER REPUBLIK ECUADOR. Ein Lebensbild, nach historischen Quellen entworfen von *Amara George-Kaufman*, Freiburg im Breisgau. Herdersche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$1.00.

A new volume of the biographical series of remarkable characters in history published by Herder, the great printer of Germany. Garcia Moreno was born in Guayaquil, December 24, 1821, died by the assassin's hand August 6, 1875, whilst filling the Presidential chair of Ecuador for the second time. His life was devoted to God and his country, to faith and fatherland, to religion and civilization, to the greater glory and advancement of the Church and the State. He died a martyr to duty. His greatest honor was to seal with his blood, the truth he had always defended by work and deed. One of the band of murderers cried out as he dealt him a fatal wound: "Die, destroyer of liberty." Moreno was heard to answer: "Dios no meure;" "God does not die." Truly in his case, the blood of the martyr has been the seed of Christians. Ecuador has shaken off the yoke of the secret societies. The public authorities solemnly dedicated the Republic to the Sacred Heart of our Lord. Religion is no longer persecuted; and the name of Gabriel Garcia Moreno is held in veneration by the whole people. The life of such a man must be inspiring. There are too few heroes in this nineteenth century to allow any of them to be forgotten and Moreno was a true Christian hero. As a youth and a man, in private life and public, as a practical Catholic and a statesman, his life is full of lessons for us.

In English we have an excellent biography of Moreno translated by Lady Herbert from the French of Father P. A Berthe, Redemptorist, and published by Burns & Oates, London.

In this life by George-Kaufmann, in German, every work heretofore published, whether in Europe or in Ecuador, has been utilized to make it as complete and accurate as possible. The work is enriched by an admirable portrait of Garcia Moreno and an excellent map of West Ecuador.

LEBENSRLAETTER. ERINNERUNGEN AUS DER SCHULWELT. Von *Dr. L. Kellner*, etc., mit dem Bilde des Verfassers. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$1.65

We have in this work a valuable contribution to the history of Pedagogy in Germany. Dr. Kellner, an old Catholic schoolmaster and school in-

spector, give us his autobiography. After an introduction of thirty pages he gives us his own work as a school teacher, beginning in 1831 and continues his memoirs down to 1886. It is a history of the progress of education in Germany during fifty years. The book is full of the most valuable information for educators. We will give only one extract which is most pertinent to our own day. Speaking of a conference of teachers he attended in 1848, he says he came away from it with the conviction that the school had become a part of politics and that pedagogy and politics had at last been inseparably united. "I did not conceal from myself that thereby a new living element had been introduced into the school and amongst teachers, but at the same time I could not get rid of the fear that thereby true human culture could be endangered and that the end of such a mastery over the school might sooner or later lead to one-sidedness and might oppress and injure free, ideal human activity." He quotes Schleiermacher's conclusion: "Where a government asserts its pretensions against the religious sentiment (of a people) in order to uphold the political, their various relations will be troubled in many ways, . . . division steps in, not only between the family and the Church, but also between families and the State, between Church and State as regards their influence in education." And stronger still the testimony of Dahlmann: "No State has ever, without inflicting injury on the best portion of its people, claimed the children as its own, to train them according to its pleasure for State ends, without regard to self-determination on their part according to environment and choice."

POMBAL. SEIN CHARAKTER UND SEINE POLITIK. Von *Bernhard Duhr*, S. J. 61c. JESUITEN-FABELN. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte. Erste und zweite Lieferung. *Bernhard Duhr*, S. J. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlags-handlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. 25c. each.

The first brochure on Pombal, the great persecutor of the Jesuits, is one of the series of noteworthy appendices or pamphlets issued by the staff of the famous German-Catholic magazine "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach." The second, *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, are the first two numbers of a most important work of Father Duhr, in which he will treat of the more common stock objections urged against the Jesuits by their enemies. We give a list of those thus far discussed: 1. Ignatius of Loyola established the Jesuit Order for the destruction of Protestantism. 2. The revelation of the general confession of the Empress Maria Theresa. 3. The poisoning of Pope Clement XIV. 4. The *Monita Secreta*, or the secret rules of the Society of Jesus. 5. The blameworthy system of education of the Jesuits. 6. The Jesuits were the real instigators of the Thirty Years' War in Germany. 7. The blasphemous profession of faith of the Jesuits, or the Bohemian-Hungarian oath. 8. The Jesuit Camarilla at the Court of James II. 9. St. Bartholomew's night, a horrible orgie of the Jesuitical spirit. 10. On the obligation of committing sin.

As in Pombal, so also in these fabulous stories against the Jesuits, the author has made use of all the light thrown on his subject by the latest historical researches, and especially by the secret archives of the various courts of Europe, which only in our time have been accessible to the student. No doubt these contributions to history will soon be translated into English. They deserve it. The history of the Church is only beginning to be studied, and the more this field is diligently tilled the more unmistakably will the divinity of the Church be manifested to the world.

GREGORY X. UND RUDOLF VON HABSBURG, in ihren beiderseitigen Beziehungen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage über die Grundsätzliche Stellung von *Sacerdotium* und *Imperium* in jener Zeit nebst einigen Beiträgen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Reiches. Von Dr. A. Zisterer, Repetent am Wilhelmsstift zu Tübingen. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder: St. Louis, \$1.15.

A historical disquisition on two remarkable personages of the thirteenth century. Clement IV. died at Viterbo in November, 1268. For nearly three years, owing to dissensions amongst the cardinals, the Holy See remained vacant. Divided as they were, into French and Italian, they could not agree on a Roman Pontiff. At last, the kings of France and Sicily came themselves to Viterbo to secure harmony and obtain an election. It was at last agreed amongst the cardinals that the choice of a pope should be left to six of their number. On the 1st of September, 1271, Theobald Visconti of Piacenza, Archdeacon of Liege, was chosen Pope. Well versed in secular affairs, the new Pope bent all his energies to secure unity amongst the Christian nations of Europe, thus to inaugurate a new crusade against the Moslem power, which was a constant threat to Christian civilization. He strove to reconcile the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. He insisted, also, on the election of an Emperor by the Electors of Germany, under severe penalties in case of refusal. Rudolph of Hapsburg was chosen Emperor. In furtherance of his one great design, the Pope called together the great Ecumenical Council of Lyons, in 1273, for the union of the Latin and Greek churches. Gregory died at Arezzo, on the 10th of January, 1276.

Our author gives an account of the election of Gregory X., his life and character; of the choice of Rudolph of Hapsburg as Emperor; the relation of the Pope to that election, and his final confirmation of the election; and the relation established thereby between the Church and the Empire.

THE WILL OF GOD IN TRIALS, DIFFICULTIES, AND AFFLICTIONS. By J. Hillegeer, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1891.

In his beautiful life of that great and spiritual man, Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulist Congregation, Father Elliott tells us that, during the last ten years of that life—years of constant suffering and sickness—"next to the Scriptures, no book served him so well during his illness as "Abandonment, or Entire Surrender to Divine Providence," a small posthumous treatise of Father P. F. Caussade, S. J., edited and published by Father H. Ramière, S. J. He used it incessantly when in great trouble of mind, and knew it almost by heart. His copy of it was thumbed all to pieces."

This little book of Father Hillegeer, S. J., on the same subject, should receive a hearty welcome. As the translator tells us in his short preface, "the author constantly makes his appeal to reason, based upon fundamental Christian truths, rather than to sentiment. He, therefore, finds comfort for the tried soul in the reasonable act, as deduced from the truths of Revelation. . . . In other words, in this brief volume the *soldier* of the Cross is held up for imitation."

Nothing happens without a Cause. We must recognize in all Things the Providence of God. In Time of Adversity we should put our Trust in God. How God manifests His Providence, especially towards Sinners and the Impious. Why it is that many complain of the ways of Divine Providence. He who recognizes the powerful hand of God in all things, is satisfied with all that may happen. Out of evil God brings

good, etc. Such are the opening chapters of the work. The closing chapters are on Patience, and are full of consolation for all kinds of sufferers. An excellent little work, and worthy of all commendation.

MATHIAS CORVINUS, KOENIG VON UNGARN, 1458-1490. Auf Grund archivalischer Forschungen bearbeitet von *Dr. Wilhelm Fraknói Tit Bischof*, zweiter Präsident der Ungar. Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Translation from the Hungarian with portrait, 48 illustrations and 8 *fac similes*). Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$2.75.

This is a most valuable historical study. When the name of Corvinus, Ruler of Hungary, is mentioned, we think only of John Corvinus Hunyady, the Christian hero, who for twenty years defended Christian Europe against the attacks of the Turks, and who died twenty days after his great victory over Mohammed before the walls of Belgrade. Fifty thousand Turks perished in that battle and Hungary was saved from the Moslem yoke. He left two sons, Ludislaus and Matthias, and one daughter, Beatrice.

Matthias succeeded to the throne of Hungary in 1458. He was born February 23, 1440, elected King of Hungary, January 24, 1458, and died April 6, 1490. The learned author cites no less than eighty-eight authorities made use of in the composition of his work, not to mention the archives of Bamberg, Berlin, Budapest, Dresden, Florence, Milan, Mantua, Modena, Munich, Paris, Prague, Rome, Venice and Vienna.

It is needless to dwell on the importance of such a work, taking in, as it does, the last half of the fifteenth century. Bishop Fraknói is well known to the literary world by his life of Bishop John Witez and the Hungarian Nunciature of Cardinal Carvajal, 1456-1461, both written in Hungarian; and the political addresses of Bishop Witez, with the letters of the great Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini addressed to that Bishop; and the letters of Matthias Corvinus, sent to the Roman Pontiffs, 1458-1490; written in Latin. His last work now translated into German, increases the debt of gratitude to this learned Bishop and scholar.

DIE XIV. STATIONEN DES HEILIGEN KREUZWEGS nach compositionen der Malerschule des Klosters Beuron, mit einleitendem und erklärendem Text von *Dr. Paul Keppeler*. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. \$3.00.

Fourteen grand plates of the Stations of the Cross painted for St. Mary's Church, in Stuttgart, by the religious of the Benedictine Monastery of Beuron. This is a new school of painting which had its origin about the year 1870. Fra Angelico, the greatest of pre-Raphaelite painters, if not the greatest of all ideal or spiritual painters, is evidently its master. Overbeck amongst modern painters is clearly one of its models. The school is neither Gothic, Roman or Renaissance, Italian, Spanish, French, German or Dutch. It is a new school imitating the classic severity of the pagan Romans and the lovely spirituality of the painter of Fiesole. Lovers of Christian art will be delighted to possess these grand copies of the Stations of the Cross. The same Monks of Beuron carried out the decorations of the great monastery of Monte Cassino, in Italy, and the paintings in the monastery of Emaus, in Prague, and Maredsous, in Belgium. All their work is instinctively religious, elevating, instructive. By their paintings they strive to make men devout, to lead them to pray—in a word, their paintings preach; the only end of all religious art.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION. By *Judge Edmund F. Dunne*. Catholic Truth Society. No. 2. St. Louis. 1891.

We do not intend to review the line of argument of the learned Judge. Those interested in this question, and it is the most living question of our day and for our people, ought to read the pamphlet and study it thoroughly.

1. We simply state that we ourselves have as yet never been able to see how the State has any right to *educate* at all. It is one thing, to enable parents to educate their children, to furnish the poor with the means necessary for such an education; and a different thing to claim the right *itself* to educate. The State ought to help the poor to educate their children, but it will be difficult to prove that such help implies the right to educate *all* children.

2. Except in case of those, entirely abandoned by their natural protectors and who therefore would become a danger to society, we cannot see how there can be any ground for compulsory instruction.

3. As Americans we are absolutely opposed to "Paternalism" on the part of the government.

These principles as being the legislation of our Plenary Councils and of the Popes, we will uphold until the proper authorities declare them wrong.

THE GOOD CHRISTIAN: OR SERMONS ON THE CHIEF CHRISTIAN VIRTUES. In seventy-six sermons. Adapted to all the Sundays and most of the holy days of the year, with a full index of all the sermons, an alphabetical index of the principal subjects treated and copious marginal notes. By the *Rev. Father Francis Hunolt*, Priest of the Society of Jesus and preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne 1740, by the *Rev. J. Allen, D.D.*, Chaplain of the Dominican Convent of the Sacred Heart, King Williamstown and of the Dominican Convent, East London, South Africa. Volumes I. and II. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic Sec. 1891.

To most English speaking clergy Hunolt is a name well known and respected. Few are there of them who have not read and profited by his sermons as translated by Father Allen. The volume before us, will, we are sure, meet with a warm and generous welcome. They comprise seventy-six sermons and treat of the chief Christian virtues. They are a library in themselves, and to many and many a hard-working priest who has not the time for continued study and prolonged meditation, will prove of highest value. They are, moreover, eminently practical sermons and suited to any state or condition. The author seeks not to preach himself, but his Divine Master. They are solid and learned productions and at the same time highly devotional. Every priest should have them in his library.

ST. IGNATIUS AND THE EARLY JESUITS. By *Stewart Rose*. Catholic Publication Society, New York, 1891.

This is unquestionably a scholarly work, and it is, at the same time, a most valuable addition to our Catholic literature in the English language. The author has collected his materials with excellent good judgment from all the most authentic sources, and has given to the public, in simple yet elegant style, an able biography of that great and providential man, St. Ignatius of Loyola, containing all that is most interesting and instructive to the reading public of him and his companions. The illustrations are antique in style; they are faithful reproductions of originals two centuries old, made by skilful artists. While the originals

do not, as samples of engraving, equal the best specimens of modern art, yet they serve their purpose admirably well of carrying the reader's mind back vividly to the period contemporaneous with the persons and the events described in the book. The author surely merits many thanks for the service he has rendered to the Catholic public, and no library should be without his excellent work.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. For the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and Advanced Classes. By *Rev. Thomas L. Kinhead*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This book is a very valuable adjunct to the "Baltimore" Catechism, that is, the Catechism prepared and published in accordance with the action of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. It is no disparagement of the Baltimore Catechism to say that its questions and answers need to be explained in order to make them intelligible to the greater number of the children in our Sunday and parochial schools. We know of no catechism of which a like remark may not be made.

The book before us therefore, aims at supplying a want which, whether it be felt or not, certainly exists. And this laudable purpose, the author has very successfully accomplished. The Catechism is preserved complete and distinct of itself. It may be used either with or without the explanations. The explanations are clear, practical and simple. They are always pertinent and withal are so interesting as regards both matter and form that we should suppose the book would be in demand by adults for their own use. We heartily recommend it.

EIN BESUCH AM LA PLATA. Von *P. Ambros Schupp*, S. J. Mit 38 Illustrationen. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. Herder. St. Louis. \$1.75.

Father Schupp gives us an account of his vacation trip from Porto Alegre, in the province of Rio Grande do Sul, or southern Brazil, to Montevideo, in Uruguay, and Buenos Ayres, on the Rio de la Plata. Besides a description of the countries, cities, inhabitants, of churches, colleges, and public buildings, as a priest he naturally speaks of the religious condition of the various places he visits. Incidentally, he gives a brief history of Uruguay and Buenos Ayres down to the present day. There are thirty-eight maps and illustrations, all model pictures. The churches, schools, colleges, and public buildings, shown in phototype, prove that those cities of South America keep fully in step with the progress of the nineteenth century. The cathedral, and the church of St. Felicitas, in Buenos Ayres, must be as fine buildings as are found in any city of the New World.

TOM PLAYFAIR; OR MAKING A START. By *Francis J. Finn*, S. J., author of "Percy Wynn," "Harry Dec," etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

"Tom Playfair" is an introduction to "Percy Wynn." Those who read the latter work will, we are sure, procure this also. It is a strong, healthy, moral book for boys. Full of exciting incidents, still everything is just as might have happened amongst small boys at a Jesuit school. Tom, it is true, is rather precocious for a boy of ten years, but the author's design of showing the formation of character and the overcoming of faults in a boy, is skilfully carried out. He thoroughly un-

derstands boy-nature and every boy who reads his book must be influenced for good by the reading.

"Tom Playfair" and "Percy Wynn" ought to be favorite premium-books for schools and would be excellent holiday gifts for the younger and even for older boys. Parents also might read the stories with great profit.

PATER DAMIAN DER HELD VON MOLOKAI MIT DREI ABBILDUNGEN UND EINEM KAERTCHEN. Freiburg im Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. 40 cents.

The readers of the *QUARTERLY* are already familiar with the life of the Sainly Martyr of Charity, Father Damien, from the admirable article of Mrs. Teeling in our Oct., 1890, number. His name has become famous all the world over and is revered by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. "Greater love than this no man hath than that he lay down his life for his friends." A good motto for this beautiful little life in German published by Herder. The work is enriched by a good portrait of Damien, a picture of his house and chapel and of the leper colony, besides an excellent little map of the Hawaii or Sandwich Islands, one of which is Molokai, the scene of Father Damien's labors, the home of the lepers.

DAS KLEID DES HERRN AUF DEN FRUECHRISTLICHEN DENKMALERN. Von *A. de Waal*, mit 2 Tafeln und 21 Textbildern. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. 95 cents.

An archaeological study suggested by the late exposition of the Holy Coat of our Divine Lord at Treves. The author treats of the clothing of our Lord as represented, whether in painting, sculpture or metal-work in the earliest ages of the Church; of the earliest pictures of the Crucifixion; of the division of the garments made by the Roman soldiers and their casting dice for the seamless robe. The work is handsomely illustrated with two phototypes and twenty-one wood cuts.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By *Tobias Mullen*, Bishop of Erie. Fr. Pustet & Co. 1892.

This work was not received until all the matter for this number of the *REVIEW* was in type, and all but the last form printed, or passing through the press. Consequently, we are only able to acknowledge its receipt and to say, from a cursory glance at it, that it appears to be a very full and comprehensive discussion of the important subject it treats, and will be especially use'ul to persons who are unable to consult existing Latin works on the same subject.

MITTELALTERLICHE KIRCHENFESTE UND KALENDARIEN IN BAVERN. Von Dr. *Anton Lechner*, Domkapitular in München. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche, Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder. St. Louis. \$2.00.

This work on the festivals of the Church and the Church calendars of the Middle Ages in Bavaria embraces the period from the tenth to the fifteenth century. It is divided into six parts, devoted to the Church-feasts and Calendars of the Dioceses of Freising, Salzburg, Passau, Regensburg, Augsburg and a Monastery Calendar. To the liturgical and antiquarian student it is a work of special interest.

IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM. WHICH? Controversial Letters in Answer to the Above Question, and in Vindication of the Position assigned by the Catholic Church to the Ever-Blessed Mother of the World's Redeemer in the Divine Economy of Man's Salvation. In Reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdom, Coadjutor (Anglican) Bishop of Fredericctown, New Brunswick. By *Richard F. Quigley, LL.B.* Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This book, which is a volume of 471 pages, was fully and favorably noticed in the April number of the REVIEW, in 1891.

EXPLICACION DEL CATECISMO ABREVIADO DE LA DOCTRINA CRISTIANA. Traducción por el Canonigo Doctor *D. J. Schmitt*, por *Bernardo Augusto Thiel*, Obispo de Costa-Rica. Segunda Edición. Friburgo, en Brisgovia, B. Herder. 1891. \$1.35.

This is a Spanish translation of Dr. Schmitt's celebrated catechism in German, made by the Bishop of Costa-Rica, and warmly commended by the Archbishop of Granada. It is another evidence of the enterprise and energy of the great printing-house of B. Herder.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[A number of the books mentioned under this head were received too late for careful examination. The mention of their titles here does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers of the REVIEW.]

BETTER THAN GOLD. By *Nugent Robinson*. Notre Dame, Indiana: "Ave Maria" Press.

THE CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. By *Lelia Hardin Bugg*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

SIMPLICITY IN PRAYER. By the author of "Les Petites Fleurs." From the French. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DI GERONIMO, OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By *A. M. Clarke*, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII. 1892. A Clero Provinciarum, S. Ludovici, Milwaukiensis, Chicagiensis, Sanctæ Fidei et S. Pauli. St. Louis: B. Herder. 50c.

CHRISTMAS-TIDE. By *Elisa Allen Starr*, author of "Patron Saints," "Pilgrims and Shrines," etc., etc. Published by the author, 299 Huron Street, Chicago.

LOVE AND FORGIVENESS. Reflections suggested by "The Greatest Thing in the World." Translated from the German. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1891.

SIMPLICITY, WOUNDED FEELINGS, WEARINESS IN WELL DOING; A TASTE FOR READING. By *Rev. Frederick William Faber, D.D.* New York: James Potts & Co.

ON CHRISTIAN ART. By *Edith Healey*. With an Introduction by *Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1892.

CHRIST OUR TEACHER. Translated from the French of *Father J. B. St. Jure, S. J.* With an Introduction by His Eminence, *James Cardinal Gibbons*. Baltimore: McCauley & Kilner.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII, tam pro Clero Sæculari Statuum Fœderatorum quam pro iis quibus Kalendarium Clero Romano Proprium concessum est. 1892. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

BIRTH-DAY SOUVENIR, OR DIARY, WITH A SUBJECT OF MEDITATION, OR A PRAYER FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. By Mrs. *A. E. Buchanan*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By *O. S. J.* Based on the German translation of *Rev. August Meer*. By *Very Rev. Boniface F. Verheyen, O. S. B.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. Prayers and devotions in aid of the Suffering Souls. By *Joseph Ackermann*. Edited by *Rev. F. B. Luebberrmann*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

PLATONS APOLOGIE DES SOKRATES. Von *G. H. Müller*. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. H. Herder, St. Louis. 25 cents. Greek text, with dictionary of words and meaning in German.

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. A Short Explanation of the Meaning of the Ceremonies of the Mass; Useful to all who take part in the Sacred Mysteries. By *Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S. J.* Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION, and on the Hidden and Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the *Most Rev. Dr. Kirby*, Archbishop of Ephesus, Rector of the Irish College at Rome. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1892.

THE LITTLE ALTAR BOY'S MANUAL. Instructions for Serving at Mass, Vespers, Benediction, etc., with the proper Responses. With Prayers at Mass, Morning and Evening Prayers, etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED ANGELINA OF MARSCIANO, VIRGIN. Promotress of the Third Regular Order of St. Francis of Assisi. Compiled from Ancient Documents by the Honorable *Mrs. A. Montgomery*. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

THE INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Translated from the French of the *Rev. J. Grou*, of the Society of Jesus. Edited, with a biographical sketch and preface, by *Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S. J.* In two volumes. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

CONTEMPLATIONS AND MEDITATIONS OF THE HIDDEN LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, according to the Method of St. Ignatius. Translated from the French by a Sister of Mercy. Revised by *Rev. W. H. Eyre, S. J.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER. "Psalliret weise!" Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie, von *Dr. Maurus Wolter, O. S. B.* Erzabt von *St. Martin zu Beuron*. Zweite Auflage Freiburg von Breisgau Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. B. Herder: St. Louis. 2. vols. \$5.50.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—APRIL, 1892.—No. 66.

THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN PROPHECY.

THE idea which is made real and actual in the Catholic Church is presented in prophecy in a two-fold manner. It is foreshadowed in facts and events of ancient historical religion. It is foretold in predictions of the prophets.

The Catholic idea of the Church presents it as a visible kingdom of God reigning through Christ, on the earth.

It is visible, not directly in all its essence, attributes and qualities, but mediately through certain external phenomena. Man is visible, though his soul is not an object of ocular vision or even of immediate intuition, by means of certain sensible phenomena of his body. In this sense Jesus Christ was visible, as St. John writes: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life." (1 Ep. John, i. 1.)¹

The body of Jesus was visible, audible and tangible, in the same sense and the same way with other bodies. Through His visible human figure, His Person, as the Word Incarnate, and the Person of the Father, were made the object of a mediate and obscure intellectual vision, "as in a glass darkly," to minds enlightened by divine faith.

"If ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also: and henceforth ye will know Him, *and ye have seen Him*. Philip saith to Him: Lord show us the Father, and it is enough for us. Jesus saith to him: So long a time have I been with you; and

¹ All Scripture quotations in this article are taken from Kenrick's *Revised Douay Version*.

have ye not known Me? Philip, he who seeth Me, seeth the Father also." (John xiv., 7-9.)

The Church, like man, is composed of soul and body, and is immediately visible as to her face and figure, mediately as to her interior essence and spiritual qualities. The composite being man, spiritual and material, soul and body, is one substantial whole, and as such he is a visible being and person, not simply visible as some kind of colored object of sight. So the Church, as to soul and body, outward form and inward spiritual essence, is one; and as a total being is visible.

The Church is the Bride of Christ. As the Bridegroom is incarnate and visible, the Bride is incorporate and visible.

The Protestant doctrine of the Church is the precise contrary of the Catholic doctrine. According to the Protestant doctrine the Church is invisible, all soul and not at all body, purely spiritual and in no wise incorporated. For, although Protestants speak of a visible Church, they intend to express by this term only an abstract concept, a logical, universal, a potential and not an actual whole, having only subjective but no actual parts existing in a real organic unity. They do not believe in a visible, catholic body, substantially one with its invisible soul. For them, a visible, corporate church is a particular society, which is one of a great number of similar churches, which are not, either singly or in the aggregate, substantially one with the invisible Church.

The Catholic idea of the Church presents it not merely as a visible, organic whole, composed of a body, and a soul which animates it, both subsisting together in substantial unity; but, also, as the medium of faith and justification for individual believers. Moreover, as in man, the body is logically and metaphysically prior to the soul which informs it, so the body of the Church is prior to its soul; the visible, corporate society is prior to the communion of saints in the spiritual life of faith and charity. The existence and development of the rational spirit in man, depend on the physical conditions of conception, birth, and corporeal environment. God formed the body of Adam from the earthy material which is the substratum of inorganic and organic substances, and then breathed into him a rational soul, *a spirit*, which vivified his body. Each man receives the rational soul which God creates, on condition of physical generation within the human species, as an individual member of the human race.

In like manner God formed the visible body of the Church, from the same material elements which constitute other human societies, and breathed into it the spirit of life. Individual Christians receive their new, spiritual life by regeneration in and from the Church, the redeemed humanity organized into a divine

society, whose founder and head is Christ, the Second Adam. The Church is the medium of justification, and, since faith, as the Council of Trent has defined, is "the root of all justification," the Church is a medium by which the faith is conveyed and transmitted to the faithful. The Church imparts through the ministry of the word and the sacraments, to each individual man, the faith and the sanctifying grace which give life to his soul, uniting him to the soul of the Church and to Jesus Christ, in the communion of the Holy Spirit, "the Lord and Giver of Life."

The Protestant doctrine of faith and justification is altogether different from this, and is, indeed, the specific difference and critical point in the original, genuine Protestantism of Luther, Calvin, and their disciples.

According to this doctrine saving faith is immediately infused into the soul of the individual by the Holy Spirit, and by means of it, as the instrumental cause, and by it alone, he is instantaneously and perfectly justified, a partial and gradual sanctification by a distinct and continuous grace following as a necessary consequence. Historical belief in the word of Christ, which is a necessary condition for saving faith, is conveyed to the mind through the Scriptures, made intelligible by a supernatural light, and prescribed to these illuminated persons as their only and sufficient rule of belief and practice. The whole number of these enlightened and sanctified persons, united by the interior bond of grace, are the invisible, universal Church. This true Church of Christ does not depend, consequently, on anything external and visible, on polity, sacraments, creeds, and common association, for existence, unity and perpetuity. The salvation of the individual soul does not depend on outward connection with any particular society, or the use of any sensible ordinances. It is an affair between himself and God, which has been finally settled to his advantage, when he received justification by faith alone.

Still, the moral necessity of association in churches, for public worship and other religious purposes, is recognized. The reason of being for these societies is, however, of a different and lower kind from that of the Church in the Catholic sense. The essential difference between the Catholic and Protestant idea is that in the former the visible Church is prior to the invisible; in the latter, the order is reversed. In the one, the Church makes Christians; in the other, Christians make churches.

The Protestant theory is one which it is impossible to reduce to practice. Protestants are inconsistent; but this what is to be expected, since Protestantism is the result of accident, a ruin, not a planned and organized structure, a heap of *débris* thrown into the position which it occupies by the effect of an explosion. There-

fore, in practice, Protestants have, in a measure, acted according to the Catholic idea of the Church.

A certain High Church party, who love to call themselves Catholics, even repudiate explicitly the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone and the invisible Church, and profess in a modified form the Catholic doctrine of the Church as the medium of faith and justification. But, rejecting the papacy and the concrete, visible unity of the Catholic Church as one kingdom, under one supreme head, they are thrown back on the concept of a visible and complete organization of the Church in each separate diocese, under its particular bishop. Therefore, on their theory, the *Catholic* Church is only an abstract, potential whole. Societies comprising many bishops and churches are only voluntary associations.

The Greeks have no theory. In practice they are a species of Protestants. Formally, they are inconsistent Catholics in a state schism. Constructively, they are a kind of Protestant Episcopalians. For all these sects which have, or pretend to have, an episcopal hierarchy derived from the Catholic episcopate by descent, there is no Catholic Church, nor even any Oriental or Anglican Church, existing in actual, organic unity. These are only many particular churches, connected among themselves into several accidental wholes, which are mere aggregations, with more or less intercommunion between separate societies, each one of which is held together either by the political power of a State, or by mutual confederations.

The Catholic Church stands singular and alone. It is *sui generis*, having a perfect theory of One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, and a real, actual existence in organic unity, from the time of Christ to the present day; the divinely instituted and ordinary means of salvation for all mankind, until the end of the world.

It is the object of the present article to prove that this Catholic idea of the Church is the idea presented in prophecy, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, in the prophetic foreshadowing of the Messianic kingdom by religious history, and the spoken predictions of the same by inspired prophets.

Everything ordered by the providence of God to bring species and individuals to their perfection and ultimate end is proportioned to their several essences and natures. A purely intellectual and spiritual hierarchy is consonant to the nature of pure spirits. It is unsuitable for man, who is a rational *animal*, having a composite essence and a dual nature. Besides, since individuals of the human species have a common origin by generation from one pair of ancestors, there is a solidarity of the whole race unlike the social bond which unites the angels, who were created each one

singly by himself, and, according to St. Thomas, a distinct species. It is, therefore, suitable to human nature that the whole order for bringing men to their last end should be in the visible and sensible sphere and related to the human race in solidarity as well as to individuals taken singly.

In point of fact, in the original state of mankind, the supernatural endowments giving integrity and elevation to human nature were conferred on Adam for himself and all his posterity. His first probation was the probation of the race, his sin and fall involved his descendants, and the promise of redemption and restoration included all who were liable to incur original sin and its consequences by their natural generation. If Adam had not sinned all would have inherited an integral and elevated nature. Because he sinned, all, with one single exception, who have received their existence by purely natural generation have inherited a fallen nature; and because of redemption by the second Adam all have been conceived and born in a state of nature fallen but capable of reparation. The Redeemer was promised as the seed of the woman, the brother by blood of all the offspring of Eve. He is the Saviour of the race, *ipso facto*, by becoming the Saviour of its first parents, Adam and Eve. There is a solidarity in the new order of grace, and each human individual is in a state of inchoate reconciliation and salvation as a member of the redeemed race of mankind.

In this new order a new generation of sons of God had to be formed from the sons of Adam, by the regeneration of grace, so that those who were naturally conceived and born in original sin, and who were liable to become sinners by actual transgression, might be sanctified and provided with all necessary means for obtaining pardon and for meriting the Kingdom of Heaven. That is to say, a church had to be formed within the human family and society.

The sacred history shows us that the Adamic race was constituted as a universal church with one faith, one worship, whose principal rite was sacrifice, a priesthood composed of heads of families and eldest sons and one moral code. When the race of Cain fell away from this primitive communion it became restricted to the descendants of Seth, and as most of these became degenerate it became still further restricted, and at the epoch of the deluge Noah and his family became the source of a new generation of the sons of God. Later on Abraham was called to become a new father of the faithful, and his grandson, Jacob, became the founder of a peculiar people, which developed into the nation and kingdom of Israel and of Judah until the coming of the Messiah.

This general history of the faith and religion manifests clearly

the Catholic idea of the Church. There is not a trace of the Protestant idea of a revelation embodied in a book which is the rule of faith to each individual and interpreted by his private judgment. From the beginning the revelation is committed to a sacred community, a church, which preserves the sacred deposit as a tradition taught to the people from childhood by authority through parents, elders, patriarchs, priests and prophets. All sacred writings are sanctioned, preserved and interpreted by an ecclesiastical authority. Faith in the one God and the Messiah is the treasure and the trust of a kingdom whose characteristic belief and hope and glory it is, from whose royal family directly, and from whose hereditary priesthood collaterally, the Messiah is to spring.

The ancestors, precursors and types of the Messiah from Adam to David exhibit in their persons the two great traits of His character as the king and high priest over the kingdom and church of God.

Adam is the sovereign and the pontiff of the human race in its primitive unity, as one political and ecclesiastical society in its elementary and inchoate form, gradually developing from the original germ of the family with its paternal government and domestic altar into a more complete polity. Noah fulfils the same office in the new world which emerges from the waters of the deluge. Melchisedec, a special type of Christ, is a king and priest. Moses is the supreme civil and ecclesiastical lawgiver of the children of Israel. Although certain special functions of the high priesthood are committed to Aaron, and sacerdotal power is separated from civil jurisdiction in the tribe of Levi and the Aaronic family, it is by Moses that Aaron is consecrated, and by him that the chosen people of God is organized and conducted to the Promised Land. The kingdom and church of Israel is one and the same society under two distinct aspects. David, as a king chosen and consecrated by the direct appointment of God, is the supreme head and ruler over the nation, which is both a kingdom and a church. He is the founder of the Holy City, Jerusalem, the author of the grand plan which Solomon executed, according to which the Temple with its hierarchy became the centre of national worship as the capital of the kingdom which at first embraced all Israel, and afterwards, by the revolt of the ten tribes, was diminished to the kingdom of Judea.

In these and other precursors and types the Messiah is revealed as a conqueror, a founder, a lawgiver, a prophet, priest and king. When one correlate is explicitly revealed the other correlate is revealed implicitly. Wherefore, the personal traits of the Messiah just mentioned imply the kingdom and church with the organized

institutions, hierarchy, laws, rites and ethical code of a perfect and unequal society over which the Messiah is the supreme head.

In the inspired writings of the prophets the coming of the Messiah as a priest and a king is explicitly foretold. His sacred ecclesiastical spiritual kingdom, its extension, glory and ultimate triumph, the new law by which it is governed, its new priesthood and sacrifice, are not only implicitly but even distinctly and explicitly predicted in these Messianic prophecies.

Jacob foretold the royal Messiah as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah in his prophetic benediction of his sons on his deathbed.

"Juda, thee shall thy brethren praise; thy hand shall be on the necks of thy enemies; the sons of thy father shall bow down to thee. Juda is a lion's whelp; to the prey, my son, thou art gone up; resting thou hast couched as a lion, and, as a lioness, who shall rouse him? The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda nor a ruler from between his feet¹ ('this alludes to natural descent,' Kenrick) till He comes who is to be sent, and He shall be the expectation of nations." (Gen. xlix., 8, 9, 10.) His Hebrew name is Shiloh. Kenrick says that "the meaning of this term cannot easily be determined." Jahn maintains that it means "Him for whom" the power is reserved. The Vulgate probably represents the same reading (*i.e.*, without the *Yod*) by way of paraphrase. It is generally admitted, even by the Rabbins, that the term regards the Messiah. The sceptre should not be taken away until Shiloh, the Messiah, should come; and much less afterwards for his sceptre rules all nations until He gives up his kingdom to the Father.

King David frequently foretold his royal descendant and heir, as appointed to be a king having a universal sway:

"But I am appointed by Him King over Zion, His holy mountain proclaiming His decree. The Lord hath said to me, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." (Ps., ii., 6, 7.)

"Lift up your gates, O ye Princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the King of glory shall enter in. Who is the King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty" (xxiii., 7-8).

"Beautiful above the sons of men; grace is poured abroad on Thy lips—therefore hath God Blessed Thee forever. Gird thy sword upon Thy thigh, O Thou most mighty, with Thy comeliness, and Thy beauty set out, proceed prosperously, and reign. . . . Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever,² the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. Thou lovest justice and hatest iniquity: therefore God (in the vocative case, O God—Rosen-

¹ "From between his feet," this is literal from the Hebrew. "From his loins" is the translation of the reading of the Latin Vulgate.

² Quoted in proof of the divinity of the Son, in Hebrews, i., 8.

mueller, Kenrick, and all ancient interpreters), Thy God hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." A direct prophecy of the Church immediately follows.

"The queen stood on Thy right hand in gilded clothing. . . . All the glory of the king's daughter is within (the interior of the palace—Kenrick), in golden borders, clothed round about with embroidery. . . . Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to Thee; Thou shalt make them princes over all the earth. (xliv., 3–18).

"Give to the king, Thy judgment, O God: and to the king's son Thy justice. . . . And he shall continue with the sun, and before the moon, throughout all generations. . . . And He shalt rule from sea to, and from the river to the ends of the earth. . . . And all the kings of the earth shall adore Him: all nations shall serve Him. . . . And in Him all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed: all nations shall magnify Him." (lxxi., 2–17.)

The prophet Zachariah foretells in magnificent language the coming of the Messiah as king and priest.

"Hear O Jesus, Thou high-priest (Joshua son of Josedec) Thou and Thy friends that dwell before Thee, for they are portending men (men who foreshadow extraordinary events—Kenrick) for behold, I WILL BRING MY SERVANT THE SPROUT. . . . And thou shalt take gold and silver, and shalt make crowns: and thou shalt set them on the head of Jesus, the son of Josedec, the high-priest. And thou shalt speak to Him, saying: thus saith the Lord of hosts, saying, BEHOLD A MAN, THE SPROUT IS HIS NAME; and under him shall he spring up, and shall build a temple to the Lord and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne. . . . And they that are far off shall come, and shall build in the temple of the Lord. (Zach., iii., 8, vi., 11, etc.).

In these prophecies of the king and priest who was to come, prophecies of the kingdom and church are both implicitly contained and also explicitly connected and interwoven. There are many others which are specially devoted to sublime and glowing descriptions of this spiritual and ecclesiastical kingdom. One of these from the prophet Isaiah, will suffice as a specimen.

"Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. . . . And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising. . . . And the children of strangers shall build up thy wall: and their kings shall minister to thee. . . . Thou shalt no more have the sun for thy light by day, neither shall the brightness of the moon enlighten thee: but the Lord shall be to thee for an everlasting light, and thy God for thy glory." (Is. ix. 1, etc.).

There may have been some partial fulfilment of these prophecies

in epochs of prosperity granted to the Jewish people before Christ, and there may be yet to come a similar and higher fulfilment in a restoration of Jerusalem and the converted race of Judah ; but it is evident that the Christian Church is their principal object, Jerusalem, the temple, and the kingdom of Judah, are the types and beginnings of a City of God which is co-extensive with the world. The sceptre remains with Judah until Shiloh comes, and He is the "expectation of nations," who reigns "from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." The new city and commonwealth of God are identified with Jerusalem and Judea, because in them was the beginning of the Messianic kingdom ; the prefatory law, ritual and polity which was developed into the New Law, the universal religion, the Catholic hierarchy and Church.

The nature and law of every development are determined by the specific essence of the germ. The acorn virtually contains the oak, the embryo the animal, the elements and principles of the completed revelation of God, of the Church in its final, organic perfection, are contained in all the foregoing dispensations, from Adam to Moses, to David, to Christ. In the beginning faith and order are in the simplest forms which can be conceived as sufficient for unity and continuity. In the process of time there is a transformation of the patriarchal religion into the elaborate, highly organized Church of God in Israel. When the Messiah promulgated the new law and founded the Christian, universal Church, his earthly kingdom, abolishing the Mosaic law as a local and temporary institution, the law of development which had been strictly enforced from the beginning, was not abrogated, but executed in a more perfect manner. According to this divine law, the visible Catholic Church was necessarily made a more highly organized body than the one for which it was substituted. If the family becomes a tribe, the tribe a kingdom, by development, the kingdom can be developed into a greater and more complex commonwealth only by changing into an empire. The confederation of the States of our own country, after independence was gained, could develop into a more perfect Union only by becoming a compact Republic, coalescing into a Nation, with its Federal and State Constitutions co-ordinated and combined into a political unity.

It is the same with the kingdom of God upon earth. The whole series of prophecies respecting the Messiah and His kingdom presents Judea, Jerusalem and the Temple, as types and beginnings which are to be fulfilled and developed in a most splendid manner during the last ages of the world. The grand object placed in view is a City of God, a new Jerusalem, to which all nations are to flow, into which the redeemed are to be gathered

from all parts of the earth, from which they are to receive light, peace, and all manner of blessings. The idea of a universal spiritual and ecclesiastical kingdom, over which Christ reigns as a king, a lawgiver, a priest, a dispenser of doctrine and grace, implies a polity, a hierarchy, a tribunal of truth and justice, a liturgy, sacraments, a perfect organic constitution, sufficient to bind all nations together during all ages in one faith, religion and moral law.

Moreover, there are explicit prophecies in respect to these several things.

First: The teaching office and authority of the Church, the constitution of the *Ecclesia Docens* is set forth in prophecy, particularly by the Prophet Isaiah.

"And in the last days, the mountain of the house of the Lord¹ shall be established on the top of the mountains." There is a similar prophecy of Micah. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains and high above the hills: and peoples shall flow to it." "And it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go, and say: come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for the law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Is. ii. 2, 3; Mic. iv. 1.)

The wise and learned commentator, Archbishop Kenrick, remarks upon these passages: "This prophecy has direct reference to the kingdom of the Messiah, which strictly belongs to the last dispensation. Judah is mentioned because the Messiah, according to His human nature, was to descend from this tribe. Jerusalem was the figure of the Church, which is the seat of His power. The great resemblance of these predictions is remarkable (viz. of Isaiah and Micah). Joel likewise has similar passages. The Church is the house of God. It appears as a mountain on the top of mountains, high above all the kingdoms of the earth. It is like a city seated on a mountain, which cannot be hidden."

We may also apply the prophecy specially to the Roman Church ruling supremely among and over the great patriarchal and primatial churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Carthage, Canterbury, etc.

The indefectibility of the Church is foretold in these words:

"This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is in Thee, and My words that I have put in thy mouth,

¹ The hill on which the temple was built was called "the mountain of the house."

shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." (Is. lix. 21.)

The perpetual teaching office of the prelates and doctors of the Church is set forth in these words:

"Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day and all the night; they shall never hold their peace." (Ixii. 6.)

What do these and other glowing predictions of the glory and light emanating from God immediately upon the Holy City, Jerusalem, signify, if not the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the supernatural illumination with which the Church is pervaded, the infallibility of the Church in the Holy See, œcumenial councils and the universal episcopate; the wondrous wisdom of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church Catholic; the splendor of her sacred science, and the brilliant reflection of the beauty of truth in the arts of architecture, sculpture, painting, poetry, music and eloquence?

The priesthood and sacrifice of the New Law are also explicitly foretold:

"The Lord hath sworn, and He will not repent: Thou art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec." (Ps. cix. 4.)

The anointing of a new high priest, whose type was called the Righteous King, who was king of Salem, *i.e.*, the City of Peace, and also a priest, offering a special oblation of bread and wine and who both antedated and surpassed in dignity, as St. Paul affirms,¹ the Levitical priesthood; implies the founding of a line of priests under the new law and under Christ, its sovereign pontiff, who should supersede and in every way excel the priesthood of the old law.

Isaiah, in foretelling the coming of the Messiah as the Christ or Anointed of God, the prophet and high priest of the new covenant, foretells also explicitly, as a consequence of His mission, the election and commission of a line of teachers, priests and rulers in the Church.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me. . . . And strangers shall stand and shall feed your flocks; and the sons of strangers shall be your husbandmen and the dressers of your vines. But ye shall be called the priests of the Lord; to you it shall be said: Ye ministers of our God; ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles and ye shall pride yourselves in their glory." (Is., lxi., 1, 5, 6.)

Theodoret comments on these verses as follows:

¹ Heb. v. 6; vii. 17.

"For from foreign nations came the governors of the Church, whom he has named shepherds and ploughmen and vine-dressers. But those most blessed ones had the name Apostle as their chief and peculiar title. For although these (bishops) have succeeded to their work, no one dares to arrogate to himself their name. He calls those the seed and offspring of the Holy Apostles who have succeeded to their office of preaching." (Succinct. in Esai. Interpr.).

Christ is a priest *in modo excellentissimo*, as immediately sent by the Father and anointed by the Holy Spirit. The apostles were priests *modo excellentiori*, as immediately commissioned by Christ and vested with extraordinary powers exceeding those which they transmitted to the Popes who succeed to the primacy of St. Peter, and to the bishops who succeeded to the ordinary episcopal office of the apostles. Wherefore, after the apostolic age, the title of apostle was reserved to the first rulers of the Church, the fathers and founders of the hierarchy. Yet the priesthood of the apostles, in all the plenitude of its dignity and power, was transmitted to their successors; and the full primacy of ordinary jurisdiction given to the prince of the apostles was transmitted to his successors in the Roman See. And besides these heirs of the full pontifical office of the apostles, the sacerdotal character was given by ordination to a greater number who were associated with them to assist them in the sacred ministry as priests of the second order, and deacons were also set apart to act as the Levites of the new law in the Christian sanctuary.

There are several passages in the prophets where the vocation of Gentiles to the priesthood is explicitly foretold.

"I come that I may gather them together with all nations and tongues; and they shall come and shall see my glory. And I will set a sign among them, and I will send of them that shall be saved (Heb., "those that escape." "The apostles and other Israelites coming to Christ escaped the calamities which fell upon the nation"—Kenrick). To the Gentiles into the sea, into Africa and Lydia, them that draw the bow (Heb., "Thaersish, Pul. and Lud."); into Italy and Greece (Heb., "Thubal and Javan"), to the islands afar off, to them that have not heard of Me and have not seen My glory. And they shall declare My glory to the Gentiles. . . . And I will take of them to be priests and Levites, saith the Lord. For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I make stand before Me, saith the Lord; so shall your seed stand and your name. And there shall be month after month, and Sabbath after Sabbath; all flesh shall come to adore before Me, saith the Lord." ("The perpetuity of the Christian solemnities is signified"—Kenrick.) (Is., lxvi., 18-23.)

The prophet Jeremiah makes a similar prediction of the priesthood of the new law in the Messianic kingdom.

"Behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel and to the house of Juda. In those days and at that time I will make the bud of justice spring forth unto David; and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell securely; and this is the name that they shall call Him, the Lord, our just one. For thus saith the Lord, there shall not be wanting unto David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Neither shall be wanting of *the priests and Levites* a man before My face to offer holocausts and to burn, sacrifice and to kill victims continually. And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying: Thus saith the Lord, if My covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night that there should not be day and night in their season; also my covenant with David My servant may be made void, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the *Levites and priests My ministers*. As the stars of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea be measured, so will I multiply the seed of David My servant and *the Levites My ministers*." (Jer., xxxiii., 14-22.)

Theodoret comments upon these verses as follows:

"The fulfilment of this prophecy we see. For a new covenant having been given, according to the divine promise, there has been given also a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec; and those who have received it offer to God continually a reasonable sacrifice. After these things he says, inasmuch as day cannot be turned into night or night into day, so it cannot be that the kingdom of David should be destroyed. And of this prophecy the fulfilment is manifest. For Christ, who sprung from the seed of David according to the flesh, has not His throne placed upon the earth, but sitting upon the same throne with the Father governs all things. And he says also the same of the priests and Levites; that their race shall be compared with the celestial host and with the sand of the sea. Facts themselves bear testimony to these words. For the whole earth and the sea is full of high priests and deacons performing the Levitical office." (Interpr. in Jer., xxxiii.)

Historical facts from the fifth century downward give us who live in this age a much more extensive view of the fulfilment of this prophecy in Christendom than that which was within the scope of Theodoret's vision. In the Catholic Church there have been between 200 and 300 sovereign pontiffs, some 80,000 bishops and 8,000,000 of priests since the days of the apostles. If this be not the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah it is nothing but a fabric of clouds in the sunshine of poetic rapture. What the

final and complete fulfilment of the prophecies foretelling the extension and glory of the Church will be we may conjecture, and hope that it will far exceed that which has been hitherto seen; but we cannot know before the future becomes the past and present. One thing we do know, by our faith in the veracity of God, that the Catholic Church, with its sacerdotal hierarchy, is like the solar system in stability and perpetuity. In one respect the interpretation of Theodoret comes short. The prophet, speaking as the name and by the revelation of God, says: "I will multiply the seed of David." Analogy requires that in like manner as the priesthood of Christ is verified in a perpetual line of priests exercising the sacerdotal office on the earth, his royal power should be verified in a line of vicegerents exercising supremacy over the Church militant, which is His kingdom in this world. The papal supremacy was fully recognized in the fifth century, the age of Theodoret. But the epoch of Gregory the Great had not yet come. The Roman empire had not yet been overthrown, the decadence of the Eastern patriarchates had not yet left the Roman Church in a solitary grandeur, the new Western Christendom, under the spiritual and temporal monarchy of the Popes, had not risen in majesty upon the ruins of Græco-Roman civilization. The special fulfilment of the prophecy in the Roman Church is therefore more conspicuously and brilliantly manifested in the history of the Church since the seventh century than it was during the earlier period of the formation of Christendom.

Malachi, the last of the prophets, declared it to be a universal principle and law, that the priesthood is the divinely-appointed institution for the custody and teaching of the revealed truth and law of God.

"For the lips of the priest keep knowledge; and they seek the law at his mouth; because he is the messenger (angel) of the Lord of hosts." (Mal. ii., 7.) The Christian priesthood is far more perfect than the patriarchal or Levitical. The new law is a far more perfect system than the old law; therefore the endowments of the Catholic hierarchy must have a proportionate excellence; and as the *Ecclesia Docens*, it must have higher and more abundant gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The same prophet foretells that sacrifice of the New Law which is committed to the hands of Christian priests.

"For from the rising of the sun even to its going down, My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation." (i., 11.)

The Hebrew word translated by *Thusia* in the Septuagint, and by *Oblatio* in the Latin Vulgate, is *Mincha*, the technical liturgical name of an Oblation of Bread and Wine. The *Mincha* was a type

of the Eucharist, and Malachi foretells the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the New Law, in which the species of bread and wine are the sacramental veils of the body and blood of Christ. So all the ancient interpreters explain it.

St. Justin Martyr: "And my friends," said I, "the oblation of wheaten flour, which was appointed to be offered for those who had been cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to offer as a memorial of the passion which He endured in behalf of those men who have purified their souls from all sin; for which reason, as I said before, God speaks through Malachi, one of the twelve, concerning the sacrifices then offered by you. And He speaks beforehand, also, concerning the sacrifices offered to Him in every place by us Gentiles, to wit of the Bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the Eucharistic Chalice." (*Dial. cum Tryphon*, Sec. 41.) "As Jesus Christ our Saviour became incarnate and assumed both flesh and blood for our salvation, even so we believe that the food blessed by the word of prayer taught by Him, and by the reception of which our flesh and blood are nourished in the very Flesh and Blood of the same Incarnate Jesus." (*Apol. i.*, n. 66.)

St. Irenæus: "And giving counsel also to His disciples to offer the first fruits of His creatures to God, not as if He needed anything, but that they may not seem unfaithful and ungrateful, He took that which, as a creature, is bread, and gave thanks, saying, this is My Body. And likewise the chalice, which is of that material creation which is about us, He acknowledged to be His Own Blood, and taught the New Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving from the apostles, offers to God throughout the whole world, to Him who gives us for nourishment the first fruits of His gifts in the New Testament, of which in the book of the twelve prophets, Malachi then predicted, clearly signifying by these words that the former people shall indeed cease to offer to God, but that in every place a sacrifice shall be offered to God, and that a pure one." (*Adv. Haer.*, iv., 32.)

Theodoret: "Having predicted to the Jews in this manner the cessation of the legal priesthood, he foretells the Pure and Unbloody Sacrifice of the Gentiles. . . . And the slaughter of irrational animals has indeed come to an end, and the Spotless Lamb Who takes away the sins of the world is alone sacrificed, and fragrant incense is offered as a kind of symbol of virtue. (*Succinct. Interpret.*)

All the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the kingdom of Christ on the earth, are, as it were, summed up in the prophet Daniel's exposition of the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. "Thus thou sawest, till a stone was cut out of a mountain without hands; and

it struck the statue upon the feet thereof, that were of iron and of clay, and brake them in pieces; . . . but the stone that struck the statue became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. . . . But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed; and His kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people; and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms; and itself shall stand forever." (Daniel, ii., 34, 35, 45.)

There is no prophecy in Holy Scripture whose general scope is more plain and indisputable than this. The great statue seen by the king in his vision represented secular imperial power in the heathen world in its successive phases, from the Assyrian to the Roman empire.

The little stone is the Christian religion. The force with which the little stone strikes the heathen world-empire is felt in the extremities of the Roman empire. A divine force, working for Christianity in the world, pulverizes and causes to evaporate and vanish the idolatrous, immoral, cruel heathenism, whose last great embodiment was the Roman empire. This is accomplished by the spreading of Christianity through and beyond the bounds of the Roman world, and by the weakening and overthrow of the empire of the Cæsars by the means of the barbarian and Saracenic invasions. It was not, however, political organization and government, as such, which were to be overthrown; for a renovated society was to succeed, a new civilization to be created, under the influence of the Christian religion.

Leaving aside for the present everything except the one dominant idea, a new kingdom springing from Judea as from a germ, and being a development of the royalty of David into the world-wide monarchy of his heir and successor, we see that the expectation of a grand Messianic empire which the Jews entertained with enthusiastic and unconquerable obstinacy, was essentially just and well founded, and only accidentally perverse.

Their expectation was perverse and erroneous, inasmuch as they had formed a low, narrow, and worldly conception of the nature of this kingdom, degrading it to the level of the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, Macedonian and Roman ideal of an universal empire, founded upon conquest by warfare, and upon physical force. It was also erroneous because they ascribed to their local and temporary religious law, a perpetuity and universality of which it was intrinsically incapable. They expected the perpetuity of the law of Moses, of the Levitical priesthood, of the temple and its sacrifices, all plainly impossible in a world-wide religion; and an extension of their spiritual and political power over all nations. They expected Jerusalem and Palestine to become the centre of the

world. They expected their Messiah to be a conquering warrior and monarch, under whom Jerusalem should take the place of Rome and hold all nations in subjection. Jesus Christ was not their ideal Messiah, and therefore they rejected Him, and compelled Pilate to crucify Him.

But they were not in error in believing that the Messiah was to be a king and found a kingdom. He was to be a king in a much higher sense than Moses and David, and to found a kingdom far surpassing the kingdom of Judah which was its type. The crown of thorns was really a diadem of universal dominion, the cross was a throne of glory and the inscription, "This is the King of the Jews," was literally true.

There may be a special and literal fulfilment of the splendid prophecies concerning Jerusalem and the Jewish people yet to come.

The angel who appeared to Daniel in the third year of Cyrus declared to him among many other things: "But at that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people and a time shall come such as never was from the time that nations began even until that time. And at that time shall thy people be saved, every one that shall be found written in the book. . . . And I said to the man that was clothed in linen, that stood upon the waters of the river when he had lifted up his right hand and his left hand toward heaven and had sworn by Him that liveth forever, that it should be unto a time and times, and half a time (*i.e.*, three and a half years). . . . And from the time when the continual sacrifice shall be taken away and the abomination unto desolation shall be set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred ninety days. Happy is he that waiteth and cometh to a thousand three hundred thirty-five days." Dan. xii. 1, 7, 11, 12.)

The "time such as never was" need not be understood as an epoch of unexampled disaster, but may denote just the contrary. The mysterious thirteen hundred and thirty-fifth day is the date of some event which is the happy denouement of the great world-drama, the scene of which, if not heaven, must be this earth. If we may suppose that a final triumph of Jesus Christ and the Church at the last period of the world-history is foretold in connection with the conversion of the Jews, then it is reasonable to conclude that they will have a principal part in bringing it about, and that one part of this triumph will consist in the restoration of the people of God to Judea and Jerusalem, in the glory of the Holy Land and Holy City as one of the most illustrious seats of Christianity.

The author of the Second Book of the Machabees quotes from a lost book, "The Descriptions of the Prophet Jeremiah" a state-

ment that "the prophet, by a divine command which he received, ordered that the tabernacle and ark should accompany him, until he came to the mountain which Moses ascended and where he saw the inheritance of God. And Jeremiah, on arriving there, found in a certain place a cave; and he brought into it the tabernacle, the ark and the altar of incense, and shut up the entrance. And some of those who were following him came there together, that they might take note of the place, but were not able to find it. Now, when Jeremiah knew this, blaming them he said: *That the place shall be unknown, until God shall gather together the congregation of the people, and become propitious to them; and then the Lord will discover these things, and the majesty of the Lord will appear and there will be a cloud,* as it was shown to Moses, and as when Solomon petitioned that the place might be sanctified to the great God he showed these things." (2 Mach. i. 1-8.)

The inspired authority of this book is not acknowledged by Jews and Protestants, and therefore the passage cannot be cited in argument with them. The case can stand, however, without it, and it gives to Catholics a strong confirmation of the belief that an extraordinary act of divine grace is in reserve for the Jewish people in the last epoch of the world's history.

A clear and decisive prediction for all Christians of the final conversion of the Jews and of the effect which this event will produce among all other nations who will witness it, has been made by the Apostle St. Paul.

"I say then: Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. . . . I say then have they so stumbled that they should fall? ("fall away forever."—Kenrick). God forbid. But by their offence salvation is come to the Gentiles. . . . Now, if the offence of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness? . . . For if *the loss of them be the reconciliation of the world, what shall the receiving be but life from the dead?* . . . For if thou wast cut out of the natural wild olive tree, and, contrary to nature wast grafted into the good olive tree, how much more shall they, who are natural, be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (that you may not be wise in your own conceit), that blindness in part hath happened in Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel be saved, as it is written: (Is. lix. 20). Out of Sion shall come the Deliverer, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob." (Rom. xi.)

It is impossible for a Jew to interpret the prophecies in consistency with the rejection of Jesus Christ as the Messiah. Therefore, the majority of the most intelligent and best educated Israel-

ites have abandoned orthodox Judaism and have become advanced rationalists. Whatever special fulfilment of the prophecies may be yet to come, in a restoration of the Jewish people and of Jerusalem, it is conditioned on their conversion to Christianity. The main, grand scope of the prophecies relates to the Catholic Church and Christendom.

The fulfilment of the prophecies respecting Christ as a king, and His kingdom, must appear in history with a magnificence which leaves the Chaldean, Medo-Persian, Macedonian and Roman epochs far in the background and deep in the shade. The new Jerusalem, the new line of David, the new law, temple and priesthood, the new kingdom of the Messiah on the earth, must both resemble and surpass the old commonwealth and religion of Israel and the old Roman Empire. We must, therefore, look to the visible and historic Church and Christendom, which from small beginnings increases to colossal and world-wide dimensions, which fills all intellectual, moral and political space, and is identified with the grand, universal development of humanity, in order to find the true object of the prophecies. Those which relate to the king are utterly unintelligible without Jesus Christ; and those which relate to the kingdom are equally unmeaning without the Catholic Church.

When we turn from the Old Testament to the New, the prophetic light is focussed and concentrated upon the majestic figure of Christ the Lord in His holy temple, and the glorious edifice of the temple in which He is enthroned.

In respect to the person of the Messiah as soon as He is born, prophecy has already, in part, received its fulfilment, and has become history. Still, as He is only gradually manifested, and His glory is for the time hidden under the veil of humiliation, He speaks of Himself in a prophetic manner, and the gospels are greatly prophetic as well as historical. In respect to His kingdom, the Church, before the day of Pentecost and the beginning of the triumph of the Church over Judaism and Paganism, the prophetic element is still more predominant, the actual fulfilment of the predictions of the old prophets and of Christ Himself being, as yet, almost entirely in the future.

The prophecies of the Old Testament are, therefore, continued in the New, only with a distinct, explicit application to the person of Jesus Christ as the Messiah, and to the society of disciples which He organized as the nucleus and germ of His world-wide kingdom.

The angel Gabriel announced to Mary, respecting the son to be born of her: "He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give Him the throne of David

His father; and He will reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there will be no end." (Luke i., 32, 33.)

When the Magi came from the East, they inquired of Herod: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. ii., 2.) There was a general persuasion prevailing at that time, as Tacitus and Suetonius testify, that a king would arise out of Judea who would rule over the world. The Lord sent forth the twelve Apostles "to preach the kingdom of God." (Luke viii., 9.) In His parables, under the figure of a mustard-seed, from which sprang a great tree, and divers other figures, He taught lessons respecting the church He was founding. He said to the Apostles: "I assign to you, as My Father hath assigned to Me, a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke xxii., 29, 30.) The merited accusation which the rulers of the Jews made against Jesus before Pilate was, that He called Himself a king; wherefore Pilate ordered the title King of the Jews to be fastened at the top of His cross. After the resurrection, He gave His final instructions to the Apostles, "for forty days appearing to them and speaking of the kingdom of God." (Acts i., 3.) The disciples, whose minds always had been and still were full of the idea of the Messianic kingdom, asked Him: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" This was the last question they asked Him. In His answer, the last words He spoke on earth, He did not reprove them for supposing that His kingdom was about to be established, or even correct their erroneous notions about the nature of that kingdom. On the contrary, He implied that their expectation was essentially well founded, although their questions about the time and manner of its fulfilment were premature. "It is not for you to know the times or moments which the Father has set by His own power. But ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses to Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth." (Luke i., 3-8.)

In the vast scope of all the prophecies concerning the royalty and kingdom of Jesus Christ, there is, doubtless, much which relates to the final and perfect consummation of the divine plan in the everlasting kingdom of heaven, which is the end and the fulfilment of all that is accomplished on the earth by the providence of God.

It is certain, however, that they relate, in part, to a specific exercise of royal power which is temporal in its nature and not identical with the universal and everlasting supremacy which belongs to our Lord in virtue of His divine Sonship. The kingdom, also, over which He rules as a temporal sovereign by a special temporal

mission in which the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit is included, is distinct from the realm of the universe, and from the consummated kingdom of heaven.

St. Paul explicitly teaches the distinction between the Messianic, Mediatorial reign of Christ, and the eternal kingdom which is His by inherent right as a Divine Person. "Then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have abolished all principality, and authority, and power. For He must reign until He put all enemies under His feet. And the enemy, death, shall be destroyed last, for He hath put all things under His feet. And when He saith, all things are put under Him, undoubtedly, except Him who put all things under Him. And when all things shall have been subjected to Him, then also the Son Himself will be subject to Him, who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor., xv., 24-28.)

The temporal kingdom of Christ, without doubt, includes more than the Visible Church Militant on the earth. It extends to supermundane realms and beings in so far as these are related to the supernatural destiny of the human race. It embraces the administration of all the affairs of men and nations. It is an interior, intellectual, moral, and spiritual rule, as well as an exterior government. Its end is to carry on and complete the work of the glorification of elect angels and men until the day of the general resurrection and judgment, and the restitution of all things. The centre and principal seat of the operation of Christ is the Church on the earth. The significance of all human history lies in this operation of Christ. Before the appearance of the Son of God in human form on the earth, all events converge toward Him; after it, all diverge from Him. Before His human birth, all is a preparation for the Christendom which He founded; and all subsequent history is the development of Christianity until its final consummation. This is the kingdom of Christ. The Christian religion, together with all that proceeds from it, accompanies it, is subordinated to it, is conquered and brought into subjection by it, is made subservient to the final triumph of Christ; when the inspired declaration of St. Paul shall be fulfilled: "God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him the name which is above every name; that at the name of JESUS every knee should bend of the heavenly, earthly, and infernal beings, and every tongue should confess that the Lord JESUS CHRIST is in the glory (or to the glory) of God the Father." (Phillipp ii., 9-11.)

That the Church is the centre from which the royal power of Christ is exercised and his glory radiated through the whole universe, is most clearly declared by St. Paul in writing to the Ephesians.

"God hath put all things under His feet; and given Him to be head over all the Church, which is His body, and the fulness of Him who filleth all in all. . . . To me the least of all saints is this grace given, . . . to enlighten all, what is the dispensation of the mystery hidden during ages in God, . . . that the manifold wisdom of God may be known to the principalities and the powers in heavenly places *through the Church*." (Eph. i., 22, 23, iii., 8-10.)

The apostle teaches that Christ and the Church are related as the head and members which constitute a body. The members are the complement of the head. The Church is the *pleroma*, that which is filled by Him who filleth all, leaving no vacuum; which is as much as to say that it is the complement of the Incarnation.

The doctrine of the entire Epistle is summed up in the passages just quoted. The Epistle to the Ephesians is throughout an exposition of the Catholic idea of the Church as defined at the beginning of this article. The Church is represented under two figures, as the Spouse of Christ and as the Body of Christ. The apostle begins from the benediction and the adoption conferred by God, through Christ, upon those who believe. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly things in Christ, . . . having predestined us to the adoption of children through Jesus Christ to Himself." He proceeds to amplify his general statement by declaring that the full and final revelation and the complete dispensation of grace have been granted through Christ. "To make known to us the mystery of His will, according to his good pleasure, which He purposed in Him in the dispensation of the fulness of time to re-establish in the Christ all things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, in Him." This is a declaration that the divine revelation is completed in the Christian dispensation of grace which is final and universal, and will go on developing on its own line perpetually, through all ages, until the perfect restitution and consummation in the eternal kingdom of God. He then specifies the Church, as a Body through which, as a medium, Christ as its head conveys the plenitude of His power and grace, making it the complement of His Incarnation, the instrument by which He accomplishes the work of redemption. The passages in which this is explicitly stated have been quoted above. The figure, Body of Christ, evidently denotes that the Church of which St. Paul speaks is a visible, organized corporation, a society of men, the Church militant, over which Christ rules. The whole context shows that he is speaking of that Church which succeeded to the ecclesiastical kingdom of Judea, and over which the apostles

were placed as its chief rulers. Having declared that the Old Law was abrogated he affirms that believing Jews and Gentiles have been made fellow-citizens of a new holy State. "For He is our peace who hath made both one, . . . making void the laws of commandments in decrees, that He may make in Himself two into one new man, making peace, and may reconcile both *in one body*, to God by the cross. . . . Ye are fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, the chief corner-stone being Christ Jesus Himself, in whom all the building framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."

The whole Christian religion is therefore embodied in the Church as a corporate, organic unity. All the privileges and duties of a Christian are summed up in his being a living member of this one Body of Christ, through which he participates in the grace which is diffused from the head into the members. "I, therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." The body is that society which is governed by apostles and apostolic pastors. "And He gave some indeed apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ." From this Body, through this apostolic ministration, *i.e.*, in the Church and by the word and sacraments, the faithful receive the grace of Christ, in order to become perfect Christians. "That . . . we may grow in all things in him who is the head, Christ; from whom the whole body, fitted together and connected by every joint which supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of each member, maketh the increase of the body to the building of itself in love." (Eph. i-iv.)

There could not be a more explicit declaration of the Catholic doctrine of the Church, as opposed to the Protestant doctrine, namely, of the substantial identity of the visible and invisible Church, the strict union of its soul and body. The Church as a visible body, animated by the spirit of faith, hope and charity, vitally united to Christ and filled by the Holy Spirit, is clearly set forth as the medium of justification, sanctification and salvation, to individual believers. It is this compact, closely connected, organic body, in which is the subministration of grace according to a measure, *i.e.*, a hierarchical order, of whose life individuals partake by their union with it. St. Paul still further exalts its prerogative by calling it the Spouse of Christ. "Christ hath loved the Church

and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it with the laver of water in the Word. That He Himself might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it may be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v., 25-26.) Here we have the note of sanctity. The notes of unity and apostolicity have been expressed above. The note of Catholicity, implicitly contained in the other notes, is explicitly expressed in another sentence. "To Him be glory *in the Church*, and in Christ Jesus *for all generations, world without end.*" (Eph. iii., 21.)

The dogma of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is clearly shown to have been placed by the apostle on the same level with the dogmas of the unity of God, the redemption of Christ and the verity of the divine revelation of the Holy Spirit. "One God, one Lord, one Spirit, one Faith, one Body."

Thus we have the Holy Scripture explaining its own prophecies concerning the Messiah as king and His kingdom, the city of God, which is the Catholic Church. The Catholic idea in prophecy is set forth in the clearest light by an inspired interpretation.

In the Apocalypse of St. John all the splendor of the prophets is renewed and surpassed. The Lord appears in His royal glory, and by his side, the Church, His spouse and queen, in this last illuminated scroll of prophecy.

"Grace to you and peace from Him who is and who was, and who is to come, . . . and from Jesus Christ . . . the prince of the kings of the earth, who hath made us a kingdom and priests to His God and Father. . . . And immediately I was in spirit, and behold a throne was set in heaven, and on the throne one was sitting. And He who sat was like in sight to a jasper and sardine stone, and a rainbow was around the throne in sight like an emerald. And round about the throne were twenty-four thrones, and on the thrones twenty-four ancients were sitting (the number of the apostolic college doubled to signify the entire Catholic episcopate) clothed with white robes and having golden crowns on their heads. . . . And one of the seven angels came and spoke with me, saying: Come and I will show thee the bride, the wife of the lamb. And he took me up in spirit to a great and high mountain, and he showed me the holy city of Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God. . . . And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the lamb. . . . And the city hath no need of the sun or the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God brighteneth it, and the lamb is its lamp. And the nations shall walk in its light, and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honor into it." (Apoc., i., iv., xxi.) This is a description of the Church triumphant in heaven. But the Church triumphant is the Church militant

brought to its perfection. The kingdom of Christ on earth is the beginning of the eternal kingdom, and possesses the same qualities in the inchoate state. Wherefore, our Lord and the sacred writers frequently blend them together and pass from one to the other in the same discourse.

In all the prophecies which have been cited, and in many others, the Church, as the city of God, is described as founded by Jesus Christ and his apostles, as continuing through all time, extending and developing with an ever-increasing splendor on the earth, and finally transformed into the glorious kingdom of heaven.

The fulfilment of prophecy must be looked for in history. Those historical facts which correspond to the predictions of inspired prophets must be what they foresaw and foretold. Historical Christianity, subsisting unchanged in unbroken continuity from the mission of the apostles, must be the genuine Christianity. The historical church is the Catholic Church. This Church alone presents a historical correspondence to the prophecies of Holy Scripture, and exhibits a kingdom of Christ fulfilling their magnificent predictions.

What is ecclesiastical history, the history of Christendom and Christian civilization with the Catholic Church left out? A mere record of mutually hostile sects, dividing and disintegrating more and more, and each one having in itself a principle of decay and dissolution. Until the epoch of the Lutheran revolt the principal sects which are schismatical or heretical have no affinity with Protestantism, but are witnesses against its principles and doctrines. The Protestant idea has no place in the history of ancient Christianity. Protestant writers on ecclesiastical history are obliged to make the Catholic Church during the first fifteen centuries their principal topic. At the earliest period in which the Church and Christianity manifest clearly and distinctly their form and lineaments, it is the Catholic idea which is embodied in the universal organic Christian commonwealth.

There are only three hypotheses which can be adopted in explanation of this fact, by one who acknowledges the divinity of Christ and the divine origin of Christianity. One is, that primitive Christianity was altered by corruption soon after the apostolic age, so that Catholicism is a pseudo-Christianity, a colossal fraud, a Satanic and anti-Christian religion. Another is, that Christ left his religion to be organized and developed in a human mode by the apostles and their successors, who built upon the foundation which Christ laid the superstructure of the Catholic Church. The third, which must be unavoidably adopted, if the other two are proved to be false and incredible, is, that the Catholic Church is a divine institution, founded by Jesus Christ through His apostles; and Catholic Christianity, the genuine, primitive, original Christian

religion. These may be called the diabolical, the human and the divine hypotheses. The first is derived from that system of theology which teaches that God loves only a small number out of the whole human race, who alone have been redeemed by Christ, and who are saved by an irresistible grace which enlightens and sanctifies each one individually by an immediate action of the Holy Spirit upon him. The rest of mankind are objects of divine hatred and vengeance, doomed irrevocably to sin and the burning lake by a decree preceding their birth. According to this doctrine, the kingdom of Satan is universal, with the sole exception of the invisible church of the elect. But, as even those sects which have most deliberately and obstinately professed the doctrines of Calvinism are casting them off with horror and disgust, and the vast body of non-Catholics have no sympathy with them, it is useless to discuss the diabolical hypothesis.

The human hypothesis is the one which finds favor with Protestants who cultivate theology, philosophy and history in a liberal and scholarly spirit. It is, however, equally untenable with the other, and much more illogical and self-contradictory. For it assumes, that as a human institution, the Catholic Church is grand and good and beneficent. Yet, if it is merely human, and not divine, it is all founded on illusion, error and imposture, and the first hypothesis is the true one. If it is grand and good and beneficent, it must be divine. If the Lord really left the organization of the Church to be constructed and developed in a human mode, like a civil commonwealth, He must have given instructions to the apostles in accordance with His intentions. He must have taught them fully and clearly what was the substance and essence of the Christian religion. They must have understood this teaching, and acted faithfully in accordance with it. They must have taught their disciples the same doctrine, and the primitive Church must have fully imbibed it. A conscious or an unconscious alteration of genuine, primitive Christianity could not possibly have taken place among sincere, enlightened and devout Christians. But the whole system of Catholicism, in doctrine, discipline and ritual, as we find it in possession at the time of the First Council of Nicæa, was either the genuine and divine Christian religion or an essential alteration of the same. The Catholic Church has always, from the first, claimed to be divine, and as such has demanded submission and obedience to her teaching, authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. If this claim is not founded on the mission of Jesus Christ, it is an usurpation, and Catholicism, like Mohammedanism, is a colossal fraud, a vast conspiracy against Christian liberty.

There is a perfect parallel here between the claim of the Catholic Church to divine authority and the claim of Jesus Christ to divine personality.

One of the most powerful and persuasive arguments for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is that which is derived from the super-eminent excellence and sanctity of His human character. He shines among the saints and sages of the world with a radiant light of moral beauty and splendor which extinguishes their united lustre, as the ascending sun puts out the stars of the sky. He is the perfect type and model of all the human virtues, without a flaw of imperfection. But he distinctly and emphatically claims to be the Son of God, equal to the Father, and one in essence with Him. If He made this claim in good faith from a hallucination of the imagination, or in bad faith by a deliberate usurpation, He was not the noblest and best of men, but far otherwise. The supposition is an absurdity. It is impossible to detract from his surpassing intellectual and moral perfection, to which the homage of mankind is given by the irresistible attraction which draws with magnetic force all minds and hearts to Himself. Therefore, because He is holy, He is divine.

It is the same with the Catholic Church. She is what she has always professed to be, divine, or else an evil work of hallucination and fraud.

This, also, is a *reductio ad absurdum*. In like manner as we can bring forward abundant and glowing tributes to the moral beauty of the character of Jesus Christ from those who have refused to give Him divine worship, or even to profess to be his disciples, so we can cite the confessions of all kinds of non-Catholics of the splendor and beneficent influence of the Catholic Church as a regenerating and sanctifying power in the world.

It is impossible to make even a plausible defence of the thesis that Jesus Christ is the divine Saviour, Regenerator, and King of the world, without recognizing in historical Christianity His Church, His religion, His kingdom. But historical Christianity is the substance and essence of the religion of Christ embodied in the Catholic Church. All intelligent and learned Protestants who have a theological, philosophical, and historical spirit and sense, are obliged to find some reason for placing themselves in sympathy with the Catholic Church of past ages, and identifying their cause with that of historical Christianity. They seek for a loophole of escape from the conclusion that they are logically and morally bound to be Catholics, and for a plea in justification of their so-called Reformation without abjuring and condemning ancient Christianity. But their effort is vain. Their admissions cannot be justified, and historical Christianity, from its earliest clear and unmistakable manifestation, cannot be accounted for, on Christian principles especially, unless it be conceded that the Catholic Church in faith, organization, and sacramental rites, is of divine origin from Christ through the Apostles, having a perpetual authority obliga-

tory on all men in all times. As Christians, they are logically and morally bound to be Catholics; they belong with us, and are inconsistent while they remain members of a sect. If they follow their better and sounder principles and tendencies, they will eventually join our ranks. Their anti-Catholic opinions and tendencies, on the contrary, logically lead to the abyss of pure rationalism, into which they must inevitably fall unless they return to the Catholic Church which their forefathers abandoned.

The fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ cannot be found anywhere except in historical Christianity and in the Catholic Church.

The kingdom of Christ is not, however, precisely and exclusively coincident with the exercise of ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction. He is king over all nations, and governs them with a view to the welfare of all mankind. The best and noblest part of His kingdom is interior, within the souls of men. Wherever there is truth and virtue, there is a part of this interior kingdom. Every soul in which faith, hope, and charity reside is united to the soul of the Church by the Holy Spirit in an invisible manner. Wherever there are sacraments among schismatical sects, there exists a partial and imperfect union with the Church which is external and visible, and, if there is no obstacle of a resisting will in the recipient, there is also a perfect interior union with the soul of the Church. Whatever is done in work and warfare against sin and vice for the sanctification of souls and the glory of God, is done in the service of Jesus Christ and in the spirit of the Church. It is an axiom that *extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*. Therefore, wherever there is *Salus*, it is *intra Ecclesiam*. The Church is coeval with the human race. It embraces all who have faith and the love of God. All that has been done in the sects against the kingdom of Satan and for the kingdom of Christ; all the truth, goodness, and Christianity in them, belongs to the Catholic Church, just as their baptized infants are made by baptism children of the Church, and not members of a sect. Heresy and schism have never given any life; they are deadly. Life is from the Holy Spirit, who animates the Catholic Church and who diffuses His grace beyond the bounds of its visible communion everywhere through the universal world. The influence of this divine grace, unless impeded by sin or ignorance, draws all men to the true Church. The prophecies of Holy Scripture foretell this flocking of multitudes, like doves to their windows, to the city and home of God, the New Jerusalem. They have been fulfilled in a certain large measure already. But we may hope that they will be more fully accomplished in the future by the healing of the schisms of Christendom and the conversion of the pagan nations.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

BEATRICE AND OTHER ALLEGORICAL CHARACTERS OF DANTE ALIGHIERI.

THE recent celebration in Italy of the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Beatrice (which is supposed to have occurred June 9, 1290), if it may be called a celebration, had this good effect, that it gave a new impulse to the study of the master-poet of the middle ages, and probably of all times; and particularly that it called forth new works which have thrown fresh light upon that mysterious figure that was the inspiring genius of all the poet's works—light which, in our judgment, will, finally, bring out her true character beyond serious doubt. Among those who, on this occasion, have written on Beatrice, says the *Edinburgh Review* (July, 1891), "the most recent, and, in some respects, the most hardy and thorough in his interpretation on points of detail, among the advocates of the 'symbolical' theory, is Gietmann, a member of the Society of Jesus, whose views are set forth in a work recently published entitled, 'Beatrice, Geist und Kern der Dante'shen Dichtung.'"

We could hardly expect the writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, consistently with the traditions of that magazine, to appreciate the masterly argument of Father Gietmann, as did some of the most ably conducted Protestant and anti-Catholic literary reviews of the continent of Europe.¹ While, therefore, we wait to hear from Father Gietmann himself on the strictures of the *Edinburgh Review*, we shall, in this paper, confine ourselves to a brief statement of the chief points of Father Gietmann's argument for the symbolic character of Beatrice.²

The critical appreciation of Dante's "Divina Comedia," as well as of his minor poetic productions, the "Vita Nuova," and the "Convito," will depend, in great part, on the view that is taken of Beatrice. She is the soul and centre of the poet's works, his inspiring genius, the ideal which moulds his life and character. If we consider her as a mere historical personage, we must look

¹ The *Literarische Unterhaltung*, in Germany; the *Dietsche Warande*, in Holland (both Protestant, and noted Dantists); and the *Giornale Storico*, in Italy (anti clerical), have bestowed the highest and most unqualified praise on Gietmann's *Beatrice*.

² Besides the poet's original works, and Father Gietmann's *Beatrice* (Freiburg, 1889), we acknowledge our indebtedness also to the same author's work, entitled, *Die Göttliche Comödie und ihr Dichter Dante Alighieri* (Freiburg, 1885), and to the translations of the *Vita Nuova* by Norton, of the *Convito* by Miss Hillard, and of the *Divina Comedia* by Longfellow; all of which we have freely used in preparing this paper.

upon those works as silly and meaningless romances, and on the poet himself as a drivelling day-dreamer. But if we are able to assign to Dante's beloved an appropriate and consistent allegorical character, in keeping with the views of the poet's time, with the peculiar bent of his mind, and with the quality of the varied material which goes to build up his poetic structures, his creations will appear not only intelligible and natural, but unfold a treasure of thought and beauty nowhere else to be found; while the poet himself will be shown to be not only one of the greatest masters of thought and imagination, but one of the noblest and loftiest minds to be met with in the history of letters.

The "Vita Nuova," and "Convito," are juvenile productions of the poet, and, as it were, the stepping-stones to the "Divina Comedia"; while the latter is, in fact, the embodiment and complete development of the ideas brought out in both the other works, as they had grown and taken shape in the poet's mind in the lapse of years.

The "Vita Nuova" (new life, or, more properly, life's spring-time), in outward form consists of a simple autobiographical narrative, in prose form, interspersed with thirty-one sonnets and canzoni, most of which have direct or indirect reference to Beatrice. It bears an erotic character, like most poetic compositions of the times. It describes, now in prose, now in rhyme, the poet's first meeting with Beatrice, at which the flame of love was enkindled in his breast; the various phases of his passion, the death of Beatrice, and his intense grief at her demise; which, however, is partially relieved by the sympathies of *another gentildonna*, whose kind attentions gradually divert his mind from his first love. This disloyalty he makes the subject of bitter self-reproach, and returns in repentance to his first affection. He suddenly breaks off his work to devote himself for some years to study, thus to fit himself to write, in strains more worthy of his beloved, "what never yet was said of woman"—doubtless the "Divina Comedia," which was to be the crowning work of his life.

It was while paying his addresses to his second love that he wrote his "Convito" (banquet, a title probably suggested by Plato's symposion), of a philosophical character, purporting to be a comment on fourteen canzoni in praise of the second gentildonna, but discontinued by the poet after the exposition of the third canzone, to devote the remainder of his life to the design and execution of the *grand canzone*, which was destined to be an undying monument to his Beatrice.

From this bare statement it must be evident to the reader that it is the same Beatrice that figures in the "Vita Nuova," and in the "Comedia," and indirectly, also, in the "Convito." She is the

dream of the poet's life, the goal of his literary aspirations, his bliss in life, his hope in death. If, therefore, the "Vita Nuova" is a mere romance, the "Comedia" is no more than a romance—a romance, all the more ridiculous and absurd, the more elaborate is its structure, the more sublime its character, and the more exquisite its erudition. If, on the other hand, we give Beatrice an allegorical part in the "Comedia," we must do so, likewise, in the "Vita Nuova," since she is absolutely identical in both works.

The poet's first encounter with Beatrice is described in such a way as unmistakably to show that she is something more than human. She had entered upon her ninth year, while the poet had nearly completed that age. She was called Beatrice (*i.e.*, bliss-bestowing) by many who knew not the reason why. She appeared to him "clothed in most noble color, modest and becoming crimson." At that moment his heart trembled within him, and he exclaimed, "*Ecce deus fortior me; qui veniens dominabitur mihi*"; while the intellectual spirit marvelled and said, *Apparuit beatitudo vestra*." From that moment, love held sway over his heart, whence he often sought her, and she appeared to him, in the words of Homer, "not the daughter of mortal men, but of the gods." He further refrains from narrating the actions and passions of this youthful stage of life, "lest he should seem to tell an idle tale."

Whatever we may think of the possibility of such an early flame in the poet's heart, we must admit that this description of his first meeting with Beatrice is marked with the character of the allegorical and unreal: which naturally leads us to look upon Beatrice as a superhuman being. The same conclusion is forced upon us by the solemn manner in which the narrative is introduced with mystic circumstances, and the symbolic number *nine*, which plays such an important part in the narrative.

His subsequent relation to Beatrice presents the same unreal, unearthly character. It is altogether improbable that she who was nearly of the same age as himself, living in the same city, the sister of an intimate friend and "nearest in kin but one"—she whom he loved so ardently and sought so eagerly should for full nine years after this first encounter not meet his gaze, and then only to greet him in the street with a passing smile. Another glimpse of the object of his bliss (*la mia beatitudine*) is granted him after a long interval—this time in a church, where the praises of the Queen of Glory were being celebrated. He gazed at her athwart another gentle lady, who was falsely taken by the bystanders to be the object of his passion. And this he also feigned to be the case for some months and years, to divert the attention of the multitude from the real object of his love. This other donna, in the holy place, who stands between him and Beatrice,

and is, as it were, the medium of their communication (he calls her the lady of the screen) is manifestly a creation that is in the closest relation with his beloved.

But he gives his Beatrice a still larger following of noble ladies. At this time he weaves into one poetic garland the names of sixty fair and noble ladies; and among these he gives Beatrice again the ninth place. Why the ninth place? Because, he says, she is *the nine*—her root is the Blessed Trinity ($\sqrt[3]{9} = 3$). But, why does he choose the number *sixty*? Apparently to personate the sixty queens of Solomon, who sang in the Canticle of Canticles: "There are *threescore queens* *One* is my dove; my perfect one is but *one*; . . . the daughters saw her and declared her most *blessed*" (Cant. vi. 7). Who Solomon's *one*, *perfect*, and *blessed* spouse is we shall have occasion to show later on. Here we shall only ask: Is this possibly the development of romance? If so, it is a romance of peculiar character, rather the production of a raving maniac than of a poet.

If we consider the poems that have been indited to her praise at this time, we must come to the same conclusion. Her praises are not to be sung for all, but only for the few, who understand them. Therefore he addresses his most pathetic canzone in her praise to those "ladies who have intelligence of love" (*Donne, ch'avete intelletto d'amore*), to those "who are more than women." In this poem she is described as the marvellous image of the Most High; the glorious rays of her splendor penetrate to heaven; she is the object of the admiration, delight, and longing of the blessed spirits. She is the source of virtue and the pledge of salvation, and

"God hath given her this greater grace:
Who saw, and spoke with her cannot be lost."

Such is not the language of earthly love. It is in the *death of Beatrice*, however, that the symbolism is most prominently brought out; and it is the description of her death that gives the clue to the meaning of the allegory. The chapter treating of her death opens with the text of Jeremias (Lament, i. 1) "*Quomodo sedet civitas*—how doth the city sit solitary that was full of people! How is the mistress of the gentiles become as a widow!" It is preceded by the description of the death of Beatrice's father, and her grief at his taking off, which foreshadows, as it were, her own death. The poet stands aloof on both occasions, and indulges silent grief. He even refrains from describing Beatrice's death, for the following reasons: First, because this does not belong to the design of the book (this portion being, doubtless, a subsequent addition); secondly, because his pen is inadequate to such a task; thirdly,

because it were unbecoming in him to attempt a description of her death; for in so doing he would be forced to praise himself—"a thing reprehensible in him who doth it." He, therefore, refrains from giving further particulars of her death. But he gives an elaborate exposition of the symbolic meaning of the date of her death, in which the mystic number *nine* again plays its usual allegorical role. This number, which figures so prominently in the life and death of his beloved, he declares, is Beatrice herself; for "*she was a miracle, whose only root was the marvellous Trinity.*"

"At Beatrice's death," continues the poet, "the aforesaid city was despoiled of every dignity; wherefore I, still weeping in this desolate city, wrote to the *princes of the earth*, somewhat in this condition, taking that beginning of Jeremias: *Quomodo sedet civitas!* This letter to the princes of the earth is that addressed to the Cardinals, 1313, when these were assembled in conclave, after the death of Clement V., for the election of a successor. To this letter we shall have occasion to return. Here we shall only ask the reader whether there is any likelihood that the poet would thus treat the death of the daughter of Folco Portinari, the wife of Simon Bardi? Is she that mystic *nine* which the heavens themselves have conspired to produce, whose only root is the Undivided Trinity? Is it on her account that the city is desolate and widowed? Is her death a public calamity of such magnitude? Is it likely to inspire the text for an epistle to the princes of the earth? It requires a more than human stretch of imagination to make such an elaborate structure of mystic imagery tally with the very ordinary circumstances of the demise of a Florentine woman, of whom history knows nothing.

After the death of his beloved, the poet abandons himself entirely to grief, but is soon partially consoled by another gentildonna, who attracts his attention shortly after the anniversary of Beatrice's death. She wins him by her compassion; he gradually begins to forget his sorrow; for which he subsequently reproaches himself bitterly. His heart turns wholly to her, while his reason rebukes it, until at length his gentle Beatrice appears to him in a vision at the hour of *none* (the ninth hour), and rebukes him for his disloyalty, whence he returns to his first love.

Who this second mistress of his affections is he plainly sets forth in the "Convito," fearing, as he says, "the infamy of being held subject to such passion as those who read his canzoni might consider him possessed of"; else his poems could not be understood, "because *they are hidden under the figures of an allegory* (B. i. c. 2). In his grief at Beatrice's death he began to read the works of Boëthius and Cicero; whence he sought and found "a remedy for his tears." He soon discovered that *philosophy* was the mistress of

these authors. "I imagined her [philosophy]," he says, "as a noble lady; and I could not imagine her otherwise than merciful; wherefore so willingly did my thoughts dwell upon her, that they could scarcely be diverted from her. And on account of this imagination I began to go where in truth she showed herself, that is, in the schools of the religious, and the disputations of the philosophers; so that in a little while, perhaps thirty months, I began to be so deeply aware of her sweetness that the love of her banished every other thought" (B. ii. 16). In another passage, he writes: "I say and affirm that the lady of whom I was enamored, after my first love, was the most beautiful and most virtuous daughter of the universe, to whom Pythagoras gave the name of *Philosophy* (B. ii. 16).

Now if, in the poet's own words, the second donna is an allegorical character personating philosophy, must we not conclude that Beatrice who is still more aerial and spiritual is likewise an allegorical personage? If the poet's own words forbid us to interpret this second donna as Gemma Donati, Dante's wedded wife, how can we consider Beatrice as Dante's mistress? We see, then, that Beatrice, who is the source of the poet's inspiration in the "Vita Nuova" and the mainspring of his entire intellectual and literary life, has not a trace of earthliness about her and that to be duly appreciated she must be regarded as *an allegorical creation*.

While engaged in these philosophical studies and in the composition of the "Convito," Dante received the inspiration of the "Divinia Comedia," which is to be a *grand canzone* in praise of Beatrice. The poet himself records the fact in this wise in the concluding paragraph or postscript to the "Vita Nuova:" "A wonderful vision appeared to me in which I saw things that made me resolve to speak no more of this *blessed one*, until I could more worthily treat of her. And to attain to this, I study to the utmost of my power, as she well knoweth; so that, if it shall please Him through whom all things live, that my life shall be prolonged for some years, I hope to say of her *what was never said of any woman*. And then may it please Him who is Lord of grace, that my soul may go to behold the glory of its lady, namely, of the blessed Beatrice, who in glory looketh upon the face of Him, *qui est per omnia secula benedictus*."

The "Divina Comedia" is, therefore, a grand canticle of praise on the object of his life-long affection. It is the outgrowth of the "Vita Nuova" and the "Convito," the embodiment of his life's thought, the full presentment of that ideal which stood in bold relief before his mind from early childhood. To this ideal all his thoughts and studies, all the then known literature, arts and sciences were made subservient. Is this ideal the Florentine's

daughter? If so, we must take the poet to be the wildest visionary and his work to be the most maudlin specimen of sentimental nonsense to be met with in literature. For the man who will regard Dante's "Divina Comedia" as a mere romantic dream there is no cure.

Non ragioniam di lui; ma guarda e passa.

Taking the "Vita Nuova and the "Convito," therefore, without note or comment, the conviction which necessarily grows upon us is, that Beatrice is wholly and solely an *allegorical figure*.

Nor has history anything to oppose to this interpretation of Dante's beloved. True, Boccaccio has built up a romance on the data of the "Vita Nuova." He pretends to have found one Beatrice, Folco Portuiani's daughter, subsequently the wife of Simon Bardi, of Florence, whom he makes the theme of Dante's song; but, whoever knows the character of the Tuscan *novellista* will give little historical importance to this narrative. A few early commentators follow him; but there is no more credence due to them than to the inventor of the fable. And though the historical Beatrice might be identified and Dante's love could be proved, yet the intrinsic evidence that the Beatrice of the "Vita Nuova," and, consequently, also of the "Comedia," is an allegorical personage, would thereby be in naught weakened. At most, it might be conjectured that she suggested the name.

The oldest and best commentators know absolutely nothing of Portuiani's daughter; Francesco da Berti, who occupied the Dante chair at the university of Padua and completed his commentary before 1385, flatly denies the reality of Beatrice. "One might be led to think," he says, "that Beatrice was a maid of flesh and bone (di carne ed ossa); but this is not the case." Pietro Dante, who is commonly supposed to have been the poet's son, nowhere gives Beatrice any other than an allegorical rôle, even when commenting on "the fair limbs wherein her spirit was enshrined." In like manner, Jacopo della Lana, who is supposed to have been the first commentator in point of time, and the "Commento Ottimo," which is certainly one of the earliest interpretations. The latter calls the literal interpretation "a secular exposition according to the outward surface." We may add that even those who put faith in Boccaccio's yarn generally admit that Beatrice, in the "Divina Comedia," at least, plays a part *chiefly* allegorical. Thus Rambaldi da Imola: "Dante, it seems to me, takes Beatrice sometimes historically, but oftener *anagogically* (i.e., allegorically) for Theology."

Nor does it weaken our evidence that Beatrice is delineated with much individuality by the poet. Individualism is one of the poetic

requirements of the allegory. We need only recall Longfellow's *Building of the Ship*, or Schiller's *Glocke*, in both of which we find descriptions more detailed and realistic than anything to be met with in Dante's poems regarding Beatrice. And yet no one will deny that these poems are allegorical.

That Dante's beloved plays a part, at least, *chiefly* allegorical, is admitted by the best critics of ancient and modern times, while the merely historical character is defended only by romancers, realists, naturalists and sensualists. But, if she is chiefly allegorical, why not altogether? Why make her change her character at the caprice of the critic? This is, at best, a cheap way to solve a difficulty. But to us it is inconceivable how a writing or document can have more than one meaning intended by its author. The assumption of a plurality of meanings intended by an author is arbitrary, if not absurd; and, instead of clearing up difficulties, it only wraps an author's meaning in impenetrable darkness.

From what we have thus far said, we think it may be gathered with sufficient certainty that, on the one hand, there is no evidence that Dante's Beatrice is an historical character, and that, on the other hand, there is the strongest intrinsic evidence that from the beginning to the end of the work she plays an exclusively allegorical part.

Having said thus much to establish the allegorical character of Beatrice, we shall now proceed to give some hints towards the *understanding of the allegory itself*. Our explanation, to which we would attribute no more than a strong probability (which, however, is amply sufficient in a literary problem like the present, will prove new to most of our readers, but will, we trust, none the less, on the evidence which we shall produce, commend itself to their acceptance. It has been proposed for the first time, to our knowledge, by the Rev. Father Gietmann, upon whose valuable researches this paper is chiefly based. It is not, however, so much a negation of, as a complement to, former interpretations by the greatest critics and commentators.

According to the more common interpretation of those who advocate the allegorical meaning, Beatrice in the "Vita Nuova" and the "Divina Comedia" symbolizes theology or the teaching of revelation as opposed to philosophy, or the teaching of reason. Rational science is represented in the "Convito" by that compassionate donna "whom Pythagoras called by the name of Philosophy," and in the "Comedia" by "Virgil," who is the poet's guide through the realms of hell and purgatory. The reason why Dante chose Virgil for his guide in the "Divina Comedia" was, probably, because his was a poetic pilgrimage, on which he had to be guided by the genius of poetry as well as of philosophy, both

of which were amply represented in the Roman poet. Besides, it can hardly be doubted that he borrowed, to some extent, the inspiration of the "Inferno" and "Purgatorio" from Virgil—not merely "the beautiful style that had done him honor." As far as mere human reason and knowledge could reach, Virgil served as his pilot, but always in the service of Beatrice, by whom he had been sent, and to whom he had to lead his charge. In the higher regions of light Beatrice alone can guide his footsteps. She might, therefore, be aptly considered as the representative of the science of theology or revelation. However, it is hard to understand how sacred science, as such, could exercise so powerful an influence on the poet's mind and heart at the early age of nine years, and produce such an ecstasy of love towards herself as described in his first meeting with Beatrice.

Others interpret Beatrice as that blissful supernatural wisdom, or *blessedness in God*, which the just and sanctified soul enjoys even in this life. She has also been identified with *infused grace*, habitual or actual; and some have considered her as the personification of the *grace of enlightenment* in particular. But, although these several opinions seem to be well grounded in portions of the "Divina Comedia" yet they do not suffice to explain the manifold influences of Dante's beloved. Scartazzini, one of the most recent exponents of Dante's thought, maintains that Beatrice represents the supreme authority in spiritual matters, or *the ideal Papacy*. Yet even this interpretation seems to be rather narrow, to take in the various functions assigned to Beatrice.

We must, therefore, seek an explanation which will comprise all those manifold functions taken together; and the only equivalent we can find is *the Church herself*, the spouse of Christ, taken in her entirety and in her ideal perfection, in all her supernatural beauty and holiness, as she proceeded without spot or wrinkle from the hands of her divine founder. She alone embraces all those various functions attributed to the poet's beloved. She is the infallible teacher of revelation, of sacred science, the saving science of the saints; she is the God-appointed dispenser of divine grace, and the supreme spiritual and supernatural authority or guide of men to their last end. Therefore we say that the Church, and the Church alone, possesses and exercises those manifold functions and influences attributed to Dante's beloved. Our theory of Beatrice has, therefore, at least the two necessary attributes of a plausible hypothesis—*requiritur et sufficit*. It is necessary, and at the same time sufficient, to explain her part.

We would not, however, have our opinion considered as a *mere hypothesis*, or theory of mere convenience, without any positive proof; for we have strong evidence in Dante's own works to sup-

port our views. In discussing the "Vita Nuova," we referred at some length to a letter which the poet wrote to the cardinals in 1313. This letter was written after the death of Beatrice, and under the pressure of grief caused by this sad event. It bears the same heading as the chapter in the "Vita Nuova," which treats of Beatrice's death: *Quomodo sedet civitas*, etc. In the symbolic description of Beatrice's death, in the "Vita Nuova," he clearly hints that the letter to the cardinals treats of the same matter; whence, he says, he began with the same words of the prophet Jeremias. But in the letter to the cardinals there is no mistaking the poet's meaning. Here he evidently means the Church, the spouse of Christ, whom he describes as dead, while he himself is the only one who stands, as it were, mourning at her bier (in *matris ecclesiæ quasi funere*). In this epistle he designates the Church no less than four different times as the spouse of Christ. "O mother, full of gentleness and pity," he exclaims; "O spouse of Christ, what manner of children hast thou, by water and the spirit brought forth to thy shame." This is the Beatrice, the blissful one, whose death he mourns, and at whose bier he alone raises his voice; whence we may also understand why he says in the "Vita Nuova," that he could not describe her death without praising himself.

The idea of the Church as the spouse of Christ is scriptural. It is fully brought out by St. Paul (Eph. v., 23-27), where he says: "Husbands, love your wives as Christ also loved His Church, and delivered Himself up for it . . . that He might present it to Himself as a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle; . . . but that it might be holy and without blemish." The same relation between Christ and His Church, according to the most common interpretation, is described in the canticle of Solomon. This was also the interpretation of our poet, as we learn from the "Convito" (B. II. 6), where he tells us that it is of the spouse of the Saviour, the holy Church, that Solomon says (Cant. 8, 5): "Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness, full of delights, leaning upon her beloved?" It is this glorious and immaculate spouse, whose death the poet mourns in the epistle to the cardinals; it is the same whom he bewails in the death of Beatrice in the "Vita Nuova"; it is the same whom he finds again, and who is described in the last cantos of the "Purgatorio" as born in triumph upon that glorious chariot representing the Church visible upon earth.

"A chariot triumphal on two wheels,
Which by a griffin's neck came drawn along.
Not only Rome with no such splendid car
E'er gladdened Africanus or Augustus;
But poor to it that of the sun would be."—(Purg. xxiv.)

In regard to this chariot of the *visible Church* we shall only remark

that it figures also in the letter to the cardinals. But who the lady is who is borne in triumph upon this glorious car, we learn unmistakably from the words of the canticle with which she is greeted (Purg. xxx.): *Veni, sponsa, de Libano!* The spouse of the canticle, as we have seen, according to the common interpretation, and that of Dante in particular, as given in the "Convito," is none other than the *ideal Church*, the spouse of Christ. The progress of the chariot and its final disappearance, as described in the "Purgatorio" (Canto xxxii.), briefly summarizes the history of the Church up to that time, when, to the dismay of the beholders, and particularly of Beatrice, it disappears in the forest; whence she foresees and predicts her approaching death, but consoles her attendants with the hope of her speedy resurrection in the words of the Saviour:

Modicum, et non videbitis me
Et iterum, my sisters predilect,
Modicum et vos videbitis me.

We see from the context that all this was enacted as a representation of what had been, in order that the poet, on his return from his fancied pilgrimage, might record it for posterity; that Beatrice, therefore, whose mystic death the poet describes here for the third time, is none other than Christ's spouse, the ideal Church.

But *how are we to understand the death of the Church?* In the letters to the Cardinals, it is described as a *quasi* death (*quasi in funere*), but with all the dire effects of real death, leaving the holy city desolate (*Quomodo sedet civitas!*). In the "Vita Nuova" it is described a *real* death, attended by the same desolation; which is fully justified, even required, by the poetic character of the allegory. In the "Purgatorio" it is again represented, as it were, dramatically, in a new allegorical form. It is, therefore, the same allegorical death of the spouse of Christ, but represented in various ways. The literal interpretation is, therefore, to be sought in the epistle to the Cardinals, in which the poet divests his diction of its allegorical attire. Now, in the letter to the Cardinals, it is evident that the death of the Church bewailed by the poet is the so-called *Babylonian captivity* of the Popes in Avignon. By the Pope's exile, in the mind of the poet, the Church was dead, her soul was, as it were, severed from the body; her visible body was removed into exile, and thus the soul was bereft of its external connatural activity. Hence the desolation of the holy city; hence the poet's grief and mourning at the Church's bier; hence the bold language to "the princes of the earth"; hence his bold bursts of plaintive passion.

But, how can the exile of the Popes be regarded as the death of the Church? Did the poet not know the words of the Church's

Founder : "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it ?" First, we must bear in mind that in the letter to the Cardinals, which was written in prose, albeit not sober prose, he calls it a *quasi*-death. For the rest, we must make a twofold allowance in behalf of the poet ; one for the boldness of his poetic conception and language, and the poetic form of the allegory in which he clothed his thoughts ; another for his fiery temperament and his political views. He was a poet, a hot-headed Italian, an ardent Ghibelline. This sufficiently accounts for whatever exaggeration may be found in this part of his allegory.

Taking this view of Dante's beloved, we have a clue to the understanding, not only of his poetry, but also of his life and character. Thus we may understand how he could come under the influence of Beatrice at the early age of nine years. It may have been at the time of his first Communion, when children are brought more closely into contact with the living Church, which, from this time particularly, begins to shape their lives by its guidance, its teachings, and its sacraments. But need we wonder that in such troublous times, when the visible body of the Church was in exile and the soul seemed to have departed from it ; when political passions ran so high—the poet should for a time grow cold in his first love to the Church, and that he should seek his bliss in the pursuit of secular learning to the neglect or exclusion of the teachings of her whom he had chosen as the mistress of his life ? And this seems to be the sum and substance of his offence against the guide and teacher of his youth and childhood. Yet he makes this disloyalty the object of bitter self-reproach.

The things that present were,
With their false pleasure turned aside my steps
Soon as your countenance concealed itself,

And Beatrice, on her part, rebukes him on her reappearing to him, not only by her cold demeanor, which made the blood freeze in his heart, but also with cutting words (*Purg.* xxxi.): "that he might feel the greater shame for his transgression, and another time hearing the sirens, he might be strong."

In an opposite way
My buried flesh should have directed thee.
Never to thee presented art or nature
Pleasure so great as the fair limbs wherein
I was enclosed, which scattered are on earth,

At this rebuke he felt as a chidden child in his guiltiness.

Even as children silent in their shame
Stand listening, with their eyes upon the ground,
And conscious of their fault, and penitent ;
So was I standing.

It was during those dreary wanderings in the *selva oscura* of worldly wisdom, without the higher direction of Beatrice, the God-given teacher of mankind, that Dante encountered Virgil, sent by his beloved to lead him back on the way of penance and atonement to the purity of his first love. The Roman poet conducts him along the *purgative way* through hell and purgatory, as far as the natural light of reason could reach, when he consigns him to the guidance of his beloved, who by her supernatural light leads him on the *illuminative way* through the spheres of the blessed, until he comes to the throne of Him who dwells in light inaccessible. Here her mission ends; for the Church on earth is concerned only with wayfarers still on their pilgrimage. Therefore, having conducted him to the goal of his journey, she retires and entrusts him to St. Bernard, the symbol of divine contemplation, who presents him to the glorious Queen of Heaven, through whose intervention he is raised to the light of glory, to the intuitive vision of the Triune God—to consummate *union with God*.

From that time forward what he saw was greater
Than our discourse, that to such vision yields,
And memory yieldeth unto such excess.—(Parad. xxxiii.)

Thus far, we have endeavored to show the allegorical character of Dante's Beatrice, as presented in the "*Vita Nuova*," as well as in the "*Divina Comedia*;" and we have tried to establish, from the poet's own works, what we consider to be the true meaning of the allegory. On intrinsic evidence, we have come to the conclusion that Beatrice symbolizes Christ's spouse, the Church—the God-given teacher and guide of individuals, and of the whole human race, the dispenser of Divine grace, the divine institution that leads men to true bliss; whence she received the name of Beatrice (bliss-bestowing) by those "who knew not how to call her." It will add new force to the arguments advanced, if we now proceed to consider the allegorical nature of Dante's poetry *in general*, and then, as far as space may permit, apply the result of our investigation, *in particular*, to some of the chief personages who figure in the poet's works, particularly in the "*Divina Comedia*."

First, we maintain that the general character of Dante's poetry is *allegorical*, or symbolic. In this view of the poet's works we are supported by the authority of the greatest critics and commentators, ancient and modern, as well as by the poet's own utterances. We cited a number of the most approved of the ancient commentators in defence of the exclusively allegorical character of Beatrice. Here, we shall only add, that the same commentators are no less explicit in the allegorical interpretation of the poet's works in

general, and of the chief personages who act in the marvellous drama of the "Divina Comedia."

Of modern critics, we shall only quote the opinion of Frederic von Schlegel, who stands in the highest reputation as a critic of ancient and modern literature. He gives a fair expression to the views which we would establish in this paper. The literature of the middle ages, he says, "may be classed under three heads—the chivalrous, the amatory, and the *allegorical*. To the latter belong those poetic compositions, of which the entire aim and scope, as well as the internal arrangement and external form, are entirely allegorical, *as is the case in the works of Dante*. While the allegorical spirit pervades the whole of mediæval poetry (including chivalrous and erotic poetry), conveying mystic meanings in the representations of life, *Dante only interweaves his representations of life here and there in the framework and structure of his all-embracing allegory*." Our proposition could hardly be put more forcibly than by saying that Dante's creations are allegorical in scope and aim, in arrangement and form; that his poetry is a "world-encompassing allegory."

Yet, great as is the authority of the German critic, we must attach still greater weight to the poet's own utterances. All his *ex professo* expositions of his poems go to prove their decidedly allegorical character. It is particularly in the "Convito" that we must look for the true interpretation of the poet's meaning. Though, in his other works he, from time to time, throws out some explanatory hints, it is only here that he gives anything like a real commentary.

At the beginning of the second book of the "Convito," before entering on the exposition of the first canzone, he reminds the reader that literary composition admits of four different interpretations—the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. The latter two, however, are closely connected with the allegorical, so that we need take no further notice of them in this paper. "The literal meaning extends only to the proper signification of words. It is merely what the words express according to that sense which is peculiar to them."

The allegorical meaning, according to Dante, is "that which is concealed under the veil of fiction (*favole*), a truth hidden beneath a graceful falsehood (*bella mensogna*), as when Ovid says that Orpheus, by the sound of the lyre, tamed wild beasts and drew after him trees and rocks; which is as much as to say—the wise man by his words tames and soothes savage breasts, and guides at will those who are estranged from science and culture. For those who do not lead the life of civilized men are, in a certain sense, to be compared with hard rocks." Here the poet takes occasion to

remind us that theologians, in the exposition of the Scriptures, take a different view of the allegorical sense, doubtless, inasmuch as in the Scriptures the allegorical supposes also a true literal meaning, while in poetry the literal meaning is only fictitious. And this difference he subsequently explains by the example of the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites, which, besides being allegorical, has also a true literal and historical signification.

The poet accordingly explains the first and second canzone of the "Convito" as merely allegorical, while in the exposition of the third, in which he has not adopted the allegorical form, he takes care to remind the reader that he had made an exception in that case, and abandoned his peculiar style, that is, the erotic-allegorical (*lo mio stile, cioè modo soave, che di amor parlando ho tenuto*); and therefore, he wishes in this canzone to be understood literally. Hence it follows that the general character of the poems of the "Convito" is allegorical; and these do not differ in their general tenor from the other productions of the poet, which are likewise allegorical. Hence, we must conclude that the poems in the "Vita Nuova," and, in fact, the entire work, which is absolutely of the same form and character as the two mentioned canzoni of the "Convito," is decidedly allegorical; and that the literal sense is not historical, as is the case in the Scriptures, in which the literal text is also historically true. If taken in their literal sense, therefore, the "Vita Nuova," as well as those two canzoni of the "Convito," according to the poet's own acknowledgment, contain nothing but "favole" and "belle menzogne," viz., fiction and pleasing falsehoods. Their true sense is, consequently, to be sought under the veil of allegory.

The same conclusion may be arrived at from the poet's letter to Cangrande, on the nature of the "Divina Comedia." Here, in discussing the literal meaning of his master-work, he restricted it merely to what the terms, the *form of the poem, i.e.*, according to his own explanation, its division into three parts (hell, purgatory, and paradise), into one hundred cantos, and into lines and stanzas; besides its poetic, fictitious, and descriptive character—all of which, as is manifest, give no insight into the true meaning of the work. The true meaning, therefore, is entirely concealed under the form of the allegory, which the poet, however, declines to unravel, leaving the interpretation altogether to the studious reader. And this we find to be the course generally pursued by the poet also in the "Vita Nuova," where he gives only the lyrical standpoint and the disposition of the poems, without, however, betraying the meaning of the allegory, leaving the true understanding to the intelligent reader (*a chi lo intende*). Nor does he care to be understood by all, but only by those who have intelligence of love (*chi hanno intelletto d'amore*), that is, by the true friends of wis-

dom. The only exception he makes is in the case of the canzoni explained in the "Convito," which he considered especially liable to misunderstanding. That the general tenor of these poems is allegorical we have already seen.

Let us, furthermore, consider how Dante handles the allegory. This is best illustrated from the "Convito," where we have the poet's own interpretation. Here he sings his love to a gentle lady in the most glowing erotic strains. His beloved is depicted with great individuality. Yet this noble lady, to whom he pays court, who smiles upon him with such sympathy is, according to his own declaration, none other than *philosophy*. "I declare and assure," he says, "that this lady, to whom I turned my attention, after my first love, is the fairest and noblest daughter of the Lord of the universe, to whom Pythagoras gave the name of philosophy. (II., 6.) The excessive ardor of love expressed in the canzoni of the "Convito," he assures us, induced him to make this declaration, lest his poetic outpourings might be mistaken for the passion of sensual love, which would cast dishonor on his name (I., 2.). Such a misinterpretation, it seems, was not to be feared in the case of the poems prompted by his first love (to Beatrice), though not less passionate in their expression. They were rightly understood, at least by those who had "intelligence of love." How the vulgar herd might understand them, the poet, as he repeatedly assures us, recked not.

Not only the person of this donna, however, is symbolic, but also her various attributes and actions. "The reader must know," he says, "that this gentlewoman is *philosophy*; who, in fact, is a lady full of sweetness, adorned with modesty, marvellous in knowledge. . . . And where I say of her, that he who will see salvation must contemplate her eyes; her *eyes* are to be understood as her *demonstrations*, which by their influence on the eye of the mind enkindle the soul to love." "And where it is said: he (*i.e.*, the devotee of philosophy) must not fear the dint of *sighs*, the meaning is: he must not dread the hardship of *study* and the conflict of *doubts*" (II., 16.). Again by his ardent *love* to this donna he wishes us to understand the *study* which was prompted by his love of philosophy, and which gained for him ever new and lofty conceptions of her worth (III., 10.). The *gentlewomen* for whom he sang the praises of this compassionate lady are those souls who devote themselves to the study of philosophy, *i.e.*, the *philosophers* themselves; her outward form is *wisdom*; her *soul* is her love to her followers; her *manners* are the *moral precepts* which she teaches; her *smiles* and *frowns* finally are the *facility* or *difficulty* of understanding her teachings (III., 14, 15).

This allegorical character is not peculiar to Dante alone. It is the predominant feature of mediæval poetry in general, and not

only of poetry ; it is the prevailing tone of all thought and discourse. We need only recall the mystic bride of St. Francis of Assisi, who is depicted by him as a lady arrayed in all beauty and loveliness, adorned with costly jewels and precious stones. And who is this beauteous bride ? It is holy poverty, whom the saint had espoused to himself in perpetual wedlock. This was the taste of the times, good or bad as we may choose to call it. Poetry was essentially allegorical ; and the form of the allegory in use was borrowed from the erotic minstrelsy of the age. If, therefore, the poet would sing the praises of philosophy, or of any other science, art or institution, human or divine, this was the poetic form which naturally suggested itself. Taking this view of Dante's poetry, which, we think, is the only view in keeping with its peculiar character, and with the spirit of the age, in which he wrote, we find it intelligible and natural ; whereas, if we try to interpret it literally, we must pronounce it not only in the worst possible taste, but even extravagant and foolish.

This, as we have shown, is the only reasonable view we can take of Beatrice. She is an exclusively allegorical creation. Let us now make the application to some of the other personages that figure in the poet's works. The evidence we advanced to prove the symbolic character of Beatrice will gain new force by the consideration of the subordinate characters which figure particularly in the " *Divina Comedia*."

Here we must distinguish between *pure* and *mixed* allegory. The former is that which has no reference to historical facts or personages ; the latter is based on historical facts, or, at least, clusters around historical personages. An instance of the former is, in our opinion, Beatrice as well as the *donna* philosophy, whom the poet sings as the object of his second love. So are also the various gentlewomen whom the poet groups around them as their handmaids.

As *pure* allegorical figures must be considered, moreover, those represented in *Purg.*, xxix. and xxxi. as accompanying the chariot of the church in the attendance of Beatrice. They are acknowledged by all commentators, as far as we have been able to ascertain, as the symbolical representations of the three theological and four cardinal virtues. And yet they are represented with all the individuality of real characters.

Three maidens at the right wheel in a circle
Came onward dancing ; one so very red
That in the fire she hardly had been noted ;
The second was as if her flesh and bones
Had all been fashioned out of emerald ;
The third appeared as snow but newly fallen . . .
Upon the left hand four made holiday,
Vested in purple, following the measure.—(*Purg.*, xxix.)

Again, after the poet ascended from the cleansing waters of Lethe (symbol of baptism), he is led into the dance of the four fair maidens; and, while each with her arm embraced him, they sang:

We here are nymphs, and in heaven are stars;
 Ere Beatrice descended to the world
 We as her handmaids were appointed her,
 We'll lead thee to her eyes; but for the pleasant
 Light that within them is, shall sharpen thine
 The three beyond, who more profoundly look.—(Purg. xxxi.)

Whereupon the three maidens, representing the three divine virtues, having inspired the poet with faith, hope and love, bring about his reconciliation with his beloved.

Turn, Beatrice, O turn thy holy eyes,
 (Such was their song) unto thy faithful one
 Who has, to see thee, ta'en so many steps,
 In grace do us the grace, that thou unveil
 Thy face to him, so that he may discern
 The second beauty which thou dost conceal.—(*Ibid.*)

If we consider these purely allegorical figures arrayed in all that life-like individuality with which the poet has invested them, can we further marvel at the individual traits with which he has clothed Beatrice, though a mere symbolic figure. If we are constrained to acknowledge that these so concrete and individual creations are but allegorical characters, why should we go out of our way to seek an historical personage to represent the lady whose handmaids are the infused virtues, theological and moral? From this concrete and life-like representation of merely allegorical personages we must conclude, at the very least, that as often as historical evidence is wanting, as in the case of Beatrice, the presumption is in favor of the purely allegorical character.

A further and still more striking evidence of the absolutely allegorical character of the divine poem is to be found in the peculiar manner in which the poet treats his *mixed allegories*, that is, those based on real facts, or persons. A prominent part in the guidance of the poet in his mystic pilgrimage is assigned to *Santa Lucia*. The name, at least, is historical. She is a virgin and martyr honored by the Church. The devotion to her, particularly in Italy, has always been widespread and intense, and it is thought that the poet himself cherished this devotion, and that he invoked the saint's intercession for the recovery of his failing sight. This is all very likely, and may have suggested the name; but, beyond the name, we do not find a single trait of her historical character.

Dante's Santa Lucia is justly considered the symbol of the *grace of enlightenment*. As such she ranks even higher in Dante's

allegorical hierarchy than Beatrice. Hence it was she who, dispatched by the Mother of divine grace, advised Beatrice to come to the rescue of the erring poet.

A gentle Lady is in heaven, who grieves
At this impediment, to which I send thee,
So that stern judgment there above is broken.
In her entreaty she besought Lucia
And said: Thy faithful one stands now in need
Of thee, and unto thee I recommend him.—(Inf. ii.)

Whereupon Lucia, "the foe of all that cruel is," repairs to Beatrice and dispatches her to the succor of her beloved. A like service she renders to the poet (Purg. ix.) when, disabled and shrouded in darkness, he is raised by her to a higher and purer sphere of light.

Again we find St. Lucy in the glories of Paradise, seated opposite to the Queen of heaven, and to St. Peter, Moses, and Adam, by the side of St. Anne, who, as her name implies, is the personification of divine grace. In all this there is no trace of the historical virgin and martyr of Syracuse; nay, this place which the poet assigns her in the hierarchy of the Saints makes us rather incline to believe either that he never thought of the historic Lucia, or that he altogether disregards her historical character, and makes her serve as a mere symbol.

Another remarkable personage in the "Divina Comedia" is the *donna soletta*, who figures in the last cantos of the "Purgatorio" under the name of Matilda. The poet encounters her on landing in the earthly paradise—

A lady all alone, who went along
Singing, and cutting floweret after floweret,
With which her pathway was all painted over.—(Purg. xxviii.)

This remarkable creation of the poet's genius, who is the mediatrix between himself and his beloved, is very commonly identified with the Countess Matilda of Tuscany, who is known in history as the powerful and judicious friend and helper of Pope St. Gregory VII., in his efforts towards ecclesiastical reform. This may or may not be the case; but certain it is that not a single trait in her character gives the least evidence of such identity. On the contrary, her character in many points is diametrically opposed to that of the historical Matilda of Tuscany. Considered historically, we would naturally picture her to ourselves as a venerable matron of mature age and grave aspect. Dante's Matilda is a young maiden in the full bloom of youth and beauty. The historical Matilda distinguished herself in the service of the Church by external works of charity; Dante's Matilda appears as

the teacher of all truth, the reconciler of the sinner, the dispenser of supernatural grace. In fact, her activity is altogether of a supernatural character; her peculiar function is the reconciliation of the erring soul with its abandoned spouse, the Church, by instruction, purification, and penance. Hence she not only instructs the poet, but immerses him in Lethe's stream, and makes him drink of the waters of penance and salvation. And all this she does in the service of Beatrice, that is, of the Church.

Hence we conclude that Dante's Matilda, whether she be the famous countess of Tuscany or not, plays a part absolutely allegorical, symbolizing the *priesthood of the Church*, whose function it is to teach; to administer the sacraments, the fountains of grace; to bring back erring souls to the bosom of the Church, that she may further guide them to their final destiny. This same mysterious personage, as Father Gietmann shrewdly concludes, figures also in the attendance of Beatrice in the "Vita Nuova." She is that *nameless donna* (the donna of the screen) who was for a time the medium between the poet and his beloved, and whom the public took to be the real object of his love, while the ardor of his affections and the numbers of his lyre were dedicated to a higher theme—the ideal Church herself, not the visible priesthood.

This symbolic part acted by Matilda, therefore, like that of St. Lucy, leads us to the conclusion that under the poet's hand those personages who seem to be historical are altogether divested of their historical character; and that, consequently, their choice is merely incidental or conventional. Hence it is that the probable historical antecedents of Dantesque characters are of little or no importance to the critic or commentator of the divine poet, as they throw little or no light on his real meaning. On the contrary, if the historical side of the characters is unduly emphasized, that only begets confusion and gives occasion to numberless contradictions.

The most historical of all Dante's characters is that of *Virgil*. He was a Lombard, of Mantuan parents, born under Julius.

He lived at Rome under the good Augustus,
During the time of false and lying gods;
A poet was he, and he sang that just
Son of Anchises, who came from Troy,—(Inf. I.)

He was of other poets the honor and light, our poet's master and author, from whom he took

The beautiful style that hath done honor to him.

Thus much the poet tells us of Virgil's history. He was, therefore, a meet guide for a poetic ramble—the representative of all the

human arts and sciences, and, like our poet himself, politically a great admirer of universal monarchy. The choice was, therefore, we take it, deliberate and, at the same time, judicious.

Yet, even in the case of Virgil the historical character is all but lost in the allegory; and Virgil's part in the action is no less allegorical than that of the aforementioned personages. Here he figures altogether as the *personification of philosophy* in its widest sense, that is, human learning and culture as distinguished from supernatural wisdom or revelation, of which Beatrice is the bearer, guardian and teacher. The historical traits of Virgil's character are merely incidentally hinted at by the poet, and are utterly irrelevant to the progress and development of the action. In fact, the Roman poet does nothing but what Plato, Aristotle or Seneca might have done as well, had the poet's fancy pitched upon one of them. His poetic genius and political views, which may have served as motives for his selection, availed him naught in the guidance of his charge.

That the part of Virgil is simply ideal, without any regard to his real historical character, may be inferred also from the place and state which the poet assigns to him in the "Inferno."

A place there is below not sad with torments,
But darkness only, where the lamentations
Have not the sound of wailing, but are sighs.
There dwell I with the little innocents
Snatched by the teeth of death, ere ever they
Were from our sinfulness exempt.
There dwell I among those who the three saintly
Virtues did not put on, and without vice
The others know and followed all of them.

No one knew better than Dante the theological impossibility of such a future state for one who had come to the years of discretion and passed his youth and manhood in this vale of tears. Whence we must infer that Dante, to suit the purpose of his allegory, made Virgil the representative of an unreal state, *i.e.*, the state of mere human reason unaided by any supernatural light or influence (*status naturæ puræ*). This position is well defined by the words of Virgil himself:

The temporal fire and the eternal,
Son, thou hast seen, and to a place art come
Where of myself no further I discern.
By intellect and art I here have brought thee.—(Purg. xxviii.)

And again, with even greater precision:

What reason seeth here,
Myself can tell thee; beyond that await
For Beatrice, since 'tis a work of faith.—(Purg. xviii.)

The Roman poet, therefore, like the characters already reviewed, though an historical personage, acts a part that is purely ideal and symbolic.

A mysterious and altogether shadowy figure in the Purgatorio is the poet *Statius*. He is represented as a Christian poet, who has been led to the light of Christianity by the torch borne before him by the poet Virgil, while the latter himself failed to see its splendor.

Thou first [so he addresses Virgil] directedst me
Towards Parnassus, in its grots to drink,
And first concerning God didst me enlighten.
Thou didst as he who walketh in the night,
Who bears his light behind which helps him not,
But maketh wise the persons after him . . .
Through thee a poet I was, through thee a Christian.—(Purg. xxii.)

It may possibly be that Statius was a Christian, but Christianity is certainly no prominent trait in his historical character. And yet, Dante makes him the ideal of a Christian poet and philosopher. He needs his service as such, and he makes him a Christian. Statius acts a part which Virgil, the representative of unaided human reason, cannot play. He is the allegorical figure of *Christian Philosophy*, i.e., philosophy enlightened and guided by supernatural revelation. He is a necessary complement to Virgil in the Purgatorio, and, therefore, he imparts instruction on points that are inaccessible to the pagan philosopher as such. With combined efforts in the service of a higher and nobler mistress (Beatrice), both guide the poet to the confines of the purely supernatural region. In this celestial realm, she, herself, will lead the way, and conduct him to the threshold of the mansion of infinite bliss.

We might go on indefinitely to examine the historical personages of the "Divina Comedia," and we would invariably find them thus divested of their historical character and donned in the mystic robe of allegory, but we feel that we have already trespassed too far on the valuable space of this REVIEW, and, perhaps still more, on the patience of its readers. We hope, however, to have produced sufficient evidence from the poet's own works to establish their decidedly allegorical character, in regard both to their general tenor and to the various characters, in particular, which space permitted us to review. Whence, we may justly conclude, with Frederic von Schlegel, that Dante's poems are essentially allegorical, while his representations of real life are only incidentally inserted in the framework of his all-encompassing allegory. Above all, we hope to have established the purely allegorical character of Beatrice, the most interesting and important personage in the poet's works. We hope to have proved with all that evidence which is possible, and necessary, in a mere literary problem of this

kind, that she is the *symbol of the ideal Church*. Thus conceived, she becomes intelligible to the Christian, and, above all, to the Catholic reader; her providence, her guidance, her influence in regard to the poet, her action in the great drama of his poetic fiction may be sufficiently explained. We believe that this conception of Beatrice will throw new light on the poet's great master-work, the "*Divina Comedia*," the idea and conception of which has, for six hundred years, exercised the minds of literary men.

According to this conception of Beatrice, the gist or idea of the "*Divina Comedia*" is this—the guidance of the poet by his beloved, that is, by the Church, from the vanities and corruptions of this world to the intimate union with God, to the highest contemplation of divine things, which terminates in the blissful possession of God Himself, by the two-fold light of reason and revelation, on the three successive ways of spiritual life—the purgative, the illuminative, and unitive. And the poet's pilgrimage is that of every individual who seeks salvation, and of mankind at large. Hence, Dante's "*Divina Comedia*," which purports to be the poetic presentment of the thought and experience of his own life, may be justly regarded as *the grand epic of the human race* in its struggle for salvation under the guidance of Christ's spouse, the ideal Church.

JAMES CONWAY, S.J.

"FATHER HERMANN."

THE grand old Carmelite order, which, gathering to itself saints, teachers, reformers, preachers, during century after century as its records swell, counts its legendary foundations even from pre-Christian times, when Elias *walked with God* in solitary sanctity, was one still autumn day, some thirty years ago, holding a festival at Lyons, great, restless, mundane, mercantile city of Jacobin and infidel, on the occasion of a new foundation.

It was a foundation which must have rejoiced the hearts of its benefactors, as they cast appreciative glances round the newly-painted walls and decorated chapel; for it was an ancient monastery of their own, once appropriated by government for barracks, and its chapel desecrated as a soldiers' dormitory, now bought back by the order to which it had first belonged, at a cost of 154,000 francs, and cleansed and renewed by the pious care of one of the most illustrious Carmelite Fathers of this century, Père Augustin du Saint Sacrement, or, as his own world will ever call him, Father Hermann.

Many of the most eminent members of the order as well as kindred religious and secular priests were present at this opening ceremony; and, indeed, at the recent Feast of St. Theresa an interesting example of Catholic brotherhood had been manifested in a High Mass sung by the Superior of the Jesuits, assisted by a Dominican as deacon, a Franciscan as sub-deacon, and a Carmelite Father as server, all joining in fraternal union to commemorate the great Doctress of the Church, that humble nun, Teresa of Jesus.

On this twenty-fourth of November of which we write, the feast of St. John of the Cross, Teresa's director and coadjutor, there had been a solemn benediction of the bells—that quaint and seldom seen ceremony of middle-age times; the four noble God-parents of the silver-toned messengers had presented their "christening gifts," a thousand-franc note each, and now the Cardinal Archbishop of the diocese, having offered the Holy Sacrifice, had joined the rest of the company at a modest *dejeuner* in the newly constructed refectory. As the Father Vicar chatted to the Cardinal about the new foundation and their guests, his eye chanced to rest upon a cluster of tonsured heads, two of whom wore the habit of St. Theresa, while the third, almost at their side, was garbed in ordinary *soutane*. One can almost fancy some

fleeting likeness caught by his keen eye, between their dark earnest glances, thoughtful yet serene countenances, and expressive Semitic features, as, motioning from one to the other, "Does your Eminence remark," he smiled, "that we have in our company *three* of the children of Abraham?"

"You are mistaken, Reverend Father," broke in a voice thrilling with emotion, as the black robed priest rose to his feet and with a magnificent gesture drew all eyes to the Crucifix which hung above their heads. "You are mistaken; *we are four!*"

The speaker was no other than the famous Père Alphonse de Ratisbonne.

His fellow-converts—they in the white robe of Carmel—were, one of them, at least, equally well known with himself in the religious world of that day. Some years ago, the present writer was invited, at the well known Carmelite Church, in Kensington, to join a confraternity whose object is the fulfilment of that too often neglected duty of Thanksgiving which seems to lie so lightly upon the consciences even of those whose petitions, worship, reparation and all other devotions, are of daily iteration. "Were there not ten cleansed?" asks the Divine Voice of the multitude of converts who throng our churches. And so this Confraternity appeals to them and to all. "It was founded," said the good Carmelite Father who brought it under our notice, "by the famous Father Hermann." Years afterward, amid far Pyrenean snows, our wandering feet led us to a once crowded health resort, now empty and forsaken by the fickle crowd in favor of newer fashions in bath and cures; and here, towering sadly and silently in the keen mountain air, stands a stately pile, with locked gates and government seal upon its door, a wreath of immortelles, as for a grave, upon its entrance; the Church of the Carmelites, from whence they have been driven away. And here again came the same words; "It was built by notre Père Hermann—this grand and venerable sanctuary—here his voice echoed, here his feet trod, here, we may say, was his retreat of predilection; the once far-famed Carmelite Monastery at Bagnères de Bigorre. Many another good work from East to West, in England and in France, claims to this day the honor of his initiative; and it seems scarcely fitting that so recently lost a jewel in the Church's earthly vestment should pass out of memory or fail to receive some grateful thoughts from those he has left behind and who, like the Associates of the Scapular and of the Nocturnal Adoration, or the 50,000 Associates of Thanksgiving, have already reaped rich blessings from his labors.

There is a large Jewish colony at Hamburg; they number, in fact, some 25,000 souls; and among them the family of Cohen may be counted as by no means one of the least in rank, being indeed a

priestly race, descendants of Aaron, of the tribe of Levi, in memory of which a Cohen, when he appears in the synagogue, holds the right of imparting the sacerdotal benediction. The subject of this memoir would in after life sometimes relate how among his childish recollections was the oft-repeated vision of his father and uncles standing, grave and solemn, on the dais or steps of the holy place, with hands outstretched, blessing the congregation.

David Cohen, the father of Hermann, was a well-to-do tradesman and prosperous member of the busy and influential Jewish colony in Hamburg. We gather that the world—with its honors, successes, interests,—reigned supreme over the Cohen household, and that they adhered rather to the modern toned down, German-speaking section of their co-religionists, who follow a reform designed to facilitate their mundane interests, than to the stern old Hebrews of other times. Hermann, with his elder brother, attended the principal college of the town, and was a precociously intelligent child, making such progress with his studies that at only nine years old he was advanced enough to be able to enter the "third class," which, it seems, caused the masters some perplexity, as the other pupils in that class averaged fourteen years and over. However the difficulty was solved by his failing health, which forced his parents to remove him from college under medical advice, and continue his studies at home. Long before this he had shown a special aptitude for music, and at six years old he not only played with wonderful execution, but composed, like young Mozart, wondrous improvisations, which held his auditors spell-bound. So, when his health broke down over Greek and Latin, they took him home, gave him a music-master, and left him more or less to himself. And then began a curious phase in his life. The "professor" to whose care little Hermann was confided, seems to have been a half crazy, half licentious musician, whose "genius" was supposed at once to excuse and explain his lawless life. Under the guise of musical study he led his youthful pupil into the wild tangles of his own "Bohemian" existence: they hunted, they gamed, they spent their nights at the theatre, their days at the café or the race-course. The boy was introduced everywhere as "le petit prodige," and his childish fingers won applause as they dashed off marvels of execution in concert after concert at the piano. They visited various German towns, and everywhere success attended them, till at last, emboldened by the encouragement he had received, and finding that his master could teach him nothing more, young Hermann, like every other child of genius before and since, turned his thoughts towards Paris—Paris the centre of the world! His parents yielded to his wishes, and, accompanied by his mother and a younger brother and sister, Hermann left the parental roof to seek fame and fortune in that capital of modern civilization.

Almost on his arrival in Paris, this child of twelve years old found himself by a strange chance and without any effort on his own part, full in the centre of all that was most brilliant, most stirring, most *intense* (to borrow a word from the art-jargon of our day) in the literary society of that time. It had been arranged that he should study composition at the Conservatoire, and claim from one of the three great masters of piano-forte then in Paris, Chopin, Zimmerman, and Liszt, the *mécanisme* of the art. So the youthful prodigy was presented to each in turn, took one lesson from Chopin, another from Zimmerman, and lastly presented himself before the fiery Pole. Liszt at first refused to take another pupil; then, half unwillingly, consented to hear the boy play; and, when he had heard him, relented and accepted the task. From that moment Hermann became the *enfant gâté*, the petted favorite of the artist. He was with him from morning till night, accompanied him to the salons of the great, played at his bidding, and was the petted darling of the beau-monde. He is described as a pretty boy of twelve years, with long girlish curls falling on his shoulders, bright eyes, and a very childish appearance—in fact, the petticoated costume of that time, when "knickerbockers" and "sailor suits" were things of the future. Bye and bye, in Liszt's own particular circle, no dinner party was considered complete without the baby musician, who would come home gaily in the small hours of the morning after a succession of visits to one salon after another whose titled occupants vied with each other to entertain for a few moments the young hero of the hour. The mother meanwhile watched and trembled at home, keeping anxious vigil for her child's return. And, when he came, the entire house was at his beck and call. No noise in the morning, for Hermann was sleeping; silence at midday, for Hermann was studying; still later Hermann, the pivot of the household, might perchance be composing; and younger brother or sister must steal in on tip-toe lest the divine afflatus be disturbed! We have known, some of us, what it is to live with genius—the genius which sleeps by day and courts inspiration by night; and the grand mother-love which so worshipingly surrounded the boy-musician with every device of tender care and anxious forethought, was in after years very tenderly and gratefully recorded, in his narrative of their home life during this Paris time.

It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that the circle of which young Hermann thus found himself a member was composed of the very cream of the artistic and literary life of that day. Need we do more than say that Madame Georges Sand, then in the height of her glory, was the only woman there, and that the authoress about whom all Paris was wondering, romanc-

ing, questioning, whispering, took Liszt's "enfant prodige" into her intimacy, kept him by her side while she wrote for days together, set him to play the piano or roll cigarettes by turns, to soothe her nerves or stimulate her imagination, and wrote and talked of him everywhere by a pet name which through her lips has resounded through Europe. "Are you not *le petit puzzi* of Georges Sand?" he was afterwards questioned by great ladies on far-away shores. "C'était comme un passeport qui me donnait entrée dans tous les salons de l'Europe." The word was an invention of Liszt's from *puzzig*, German for *darling*; and "ce charmant personnage de puzzi," "le mélancolique puzzi" was ever on their lips and pens. He tells himself, naïvely enough, how when first presented to the authoress he had never read her works, but knew she was spoken of with praise; and soon, when not actually at her side, he became so absorbed in those wondrous romances that he almost neglected his own beloved piano, and could only bring himself to the necessary hours of practice by propping up his *Lelia* or *Consuelo* upon the music rest of his piano and devouring it with his eyes while mechanically running scales. Another intimate friend—though we can scarce call it friendship between the man of mature years and the boy of twelve—but patron or admirer, was La Mennais, who for some time was young Hermann's chosen master and hero, his oracle, from whose lips he drank in every wild breath of revolt, insubordination and erroneous philosophy preached so vehemently by the author of that magnificently resonant yet untrue phrase with which he threw down the glove in his challenge to society and religion, "l'homme est né libre, et pourtant il est dans les fers." Perhaps the tiny volume still exists on whose opening page is traced the words: "Souvenir offert à mon cher petit puzzi par F. de la Mennais." Like others, Hermann dreamed that the golden age was approaching, heralded by "Les Paroles d'un Croyant," and recorded in "Le Monde," a journal under the joint editorship of George Sand and La Mennais. Passing over to Geneva with Liszt, who had been asked to form a new Conservatoire there, he made pilgrimages to Fernay and rhapsodied before Rousseau's statue, while his eccentric master, who had led his feet to the pasture of Voltairianism, chanced to awaken for one moment in his pupil some fleeting thought of becoming a Christian by the gift of a Bible, in which was written, "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God"; but he was uncertain whether to embrace Catholicity or Protestantism, and so the brief fancy passed away.

To be clean of heart! What a yearning there lies deep down in the heart of the most God-forgetting souls after their own long lost purity! As sings a poet among that that self same company:

"Etre pur, etre sublime, etre fier, et croire,
A toute pureté."

Hermann drank deep of the fount of worldly pleasure among the artists' circle in which he lived. He continued to play in public and to pursue the study of music, rather because of the money it brought him, and which he spent in gaming and luxurious living, than for its own sake, and so the years passed on, while he went hither and thither, to Italy, to London, to his own native Hamburg, giving concerts, and successful ones, too, wherever he went. He became acquainted with Mario, then in the zenith of his fame, and together they passed seasons in Paris, winters in London, where Mario sang and Hermann played and gave lessons, and both reaped a rich harvest from their joint labors. And meanwhile, all unknown to themselves and to the world, the hour of grace drew nigh.

One Friday in the month of May, 1847, a certain Prince de la Moskowa made of Hermann Cohen a seemingly trivial request. It was that the young pianist would replace him during the Fridays in May at a neighboring church where he was unable to fulfil an engagement to sing with an amateur choir at benediction. Hermann readily assented and went to the place indicated the same day. At the moment of benediction a sudden, swift, indefinable emotion seemed, as it were, to sweep open the soul of the young Jew. We cannot express—he himself declared that he could not put it into words—suffice it to say that a week passed by, and on the following Friday he was again at his post. This time, as the Sacred Host was uplifted for adoration the same sensation returned. "I felt, as it were, a great weight descend upon me which *forced me to my knees*, yea, even to bow to the ground in adoration." The month of May went by, yet again and again Hermann returned to kneel in the same place. On Sundays at Mass his whole soul seemed moved; he hunted out a dust-laden prayer book on the shelves of one of his friends, studied it, prayed from it, and finally, going to the Duchesse de Kangan, begged her to direct him to a priest. Still the conversion was not altogether accomplished. As he said himself: "Y'avis peur des pretres," and the fatherly counsels of the good Abbé Legrand, to whom the Duchesse had introduced him, won his admiration rather than his contrition. While thus wavering he went to Ems to give a concert, and on the Sunday after his arrival he went to Mass, as had become of late his custom. As the Mass proceeded he felt the same supernatural emotion again flood his soul, and at the moment of the Elevation a burst of tears gushed from his eyes, and he knew that grace had found him. "I had often wept in my childhood, but never such tears as those. All at once I saw before me all the sins of my

past life, hideous, vile, revolting, worthy the wrath of the Sovereign Judge. And yet I felt also a wondrous calm, God in his mercy forgiving me these sins and accepting my firm resolution to love Him above all things henceforth. I left that church a Christian, as much Christian as it is possible to be without yet having received holy baptism." On leaving the Church after Mass he was met and questioned by a pious lady of his acquaintance, an ambassador's wife, on the cause of his evident emotion. He told her, and she remarked that this grace must have come to him through Mary, to whom he should therefore bear special devotion; and as she bid him farewell she placed in his hands a little picture of the Assumption. The following day, eager to revisit the good Abbé who had begun his instruction, he returned to Paris, and there, so transfigured by grace as to be literally hardly recognizable, he read, prayed, studied as a catechumen.

The Abbé de Ratisbonne, himself a convert from Judaism, has built a memorial chapel of that miracle of divine grace in the Rue du Regard, Paris, and to it is attached a convent whose inmates, nuns and orphans, have each and all been gathered out of the darkness of Judaism into the light of faith. Here they pray, work, and suffer for the conversion of their brethren; here, from time to time, the healing waters of baptism descend upon some trembling neophyte; and here, on the twenty-eighth of August, a Saturday, the day specially consecrated to the Blessed Virgin, at three o'clock in the afternoon, before a numerous and fervent crowd of fellow-worshippers, Hermann Cohen was received into the Fold of Christ.

"Wilt thou be baptized?"

"I will."

And the chorus of white-robed maidens broke into a litany composed by Père Ratisbonne:

"Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews,

"Have mercy upon the children of Israel,

"Jesus, Divine Messiah expected by the Jews,

"Have mercy, etc.

"Jesus, the Desired of Nations,

"Jesus, of the Tribe of Juda,

"Jesus, Who didst heal the deaf, the dumb, the blind,

"Have mercy, etc.

"Lamb of God Who takest away the sins of the world,

"Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

And as they sang the waters of baptism fell upon the kneeling catechumen, and in the rapture of that moment he seemed for one brief moment to catch in very actuality a glimpse of the Paradise of God.

And now a new page began in the life of the heretofore Jew musician, Hermann Cohen, now "Mary Augustine Henry," soon to be also "of the Blessed Sacrament." His longed-for first communion took place ten days after his baptism, on the 8th of September, 1847, and, three months later, his confirmation, at the hands of the martyr Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Affne, who not long afterwards was called on, like his Divine Master, to give his life for his sheep. It has often been noticed that almost every convert to the Catholic faith, whether from Protestantism or other heresy, has, at the time of his reception into the Church, been drawn by some special point, some particular aspect of the Church, or dogma, or devotion, which to that soul has proved the magnet of his heart's attraction.

With some it is the intellectual side, validity of orders, the supremacy of the See of Peter, the necessity for an infallible teacher; or, as with Newman, the testimony of history; or, as with Faber, the visible unity of the Church. With others it is the more emotional side, the need of absolution, the communion of saints, the cultus of Mary, or, as in the case of Hermann, the presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. One has known souls to whom the practices of the Church seemed almost a blank, confession unneeded, even shrunk from; the doctrines of the Church "hard sayings," and submission a fierce struggle; who yet could not choose but enter, so strange and strong became the drawing, so passionate the yearning, to kneel at the Altar and receive the Bread of Heaven. Hermann was one of these. He says himself, in his journal, that "while yet a Jew he longed with great desire to fly to the holy table," and yearned after baptism only that he might be united to Jesus in Holy Communion. "I wept with envy," he writes, "on seeing others communicate."

On becoming a Christian, the thoughts of this "convert of the Holy Eucharist," as he styled himself, flew naturally towards the sacerdotal or religious life; but he had 30,000 francs of debts to pay, and was forced to remain in the world until, having earned that amount by concerts and lessons, he should be free. So he started anew on the path of "scales, scales, nothing but scales," through which every would-be pianist, from Chopin to the beginner of to-day, must needs pass, reading, as he fingered the notes, no longer George Sand and her contemporaries, but "*La Perfection Chretienne*" of Rodriquez. During the time of his former successes as pianist, he had occasionally attempted composition, but met with little success. Now, with the quickened instincts of his new life he turned his pen towards the composition of religious melodies, and produced a number of hymns and other works which, notably a collection of "22 Cantiques" in honor of the

Blessed Virgin, met with enthusiastic approval and popularity. Long after he had been invested with the robe of a Carmelite Father, a Mass of his own composition was sung at Bordeaux at the close of a mission, and, with its grave, sweet, solemn harmonies, "seemed," as one of its auditors recorded, "an echo from celestial choirs."

During the interval of waiting between baptism and his novitiate, and while working hard to pay his debts, he, in concert with M. de la Bomblerie, founded the now well-known "*Œuvre de l'Adoration Nocturne*," for the object, as the notes of its first meeting record, of "the Exposition and Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, the reparation of the injuries and insults offered to it, and to draw down upon France the benediction of God and avert the punishments which menace her."

As soon as, having paid his debts, he found himself free to embrace the religious life, he consulted various theologians as to whether he should become a religious or a secular priest, and, amongst others, the celebrated Dominican, Père Lacordaire.

"Have you the courage to let yourself be spit upon in the face and not say a word?" asked Lacordaire.

"Yes," replied his questioner, unhesitatingly.

"Then go and be a monk!"

He presented himself accordingly at a Carmelite monastery near Bordeaux, and was admitted as a postulant; but it was necessary to obtain a special dispensation for the admission of a converted Jew into the order, and this permission was refused by the Superior-General, who feared that the neophyte was too recent a convert for admission. Nothing daunted, Hermann journeyed to Rome with the intention of appealing to the Pope, but, finding the Council-General of the Carmelite order just assembled there, he laid his case before them, and had the joy of receiving an affirmative reply. Back to Bordeaux he flew, waiting for nothing, not even to see the Pope, who was at Naples, in his eagerness to enter the novitiate, and on the sixth of October he put on the religious habit.

One hardly dares to penetrate the sacred retirement of a religious novitiate; yet we cannot choose but linger over some of the echoes which reach us in letters or visits from relations. The sole favors which Hermann had asked on entering was that his cell might be the one nearest to the chapel, that so in the lonely night watches he might feel as close as possible to the Tabernacle. His first tasks as a novice were the daily cleansing of the offices, sweeping the passages, and dusting the community room. These he found delightful, and the humble fare of meagre soups and cabbage in scanty measure so delicious, that he declared himself forced to distract his attention from the food while eating, lest he should

give way to over-indulgence. His novitiate lasted for a year, during which time his mother visited him and remained for ten days essaying by every means she could devise to turn him from his purpose of becoming a religious; while he on his side wept and prayed for her conversion. On the 7th of October, 1850, he was professed, and on the 20th of April following, Easter Eve, ordained a priest, saying his first Mass on Easter Sunday and preaching his first sermon—on "Frequent Communion"—within the same week. From this sermon onwards, during all his active and eloquent apostolate, it was afterwards remarked that he never preached a single sermon without some reference to the Blessed Sacrament; he had, in fact, bound himself by vow never to do so.

We might naturally suppose that so ardent a convert as the novice, now Père, Hermann, and one too with whom family affection had ever been a prominent feature in his life, should turn his thoughts and prayers with special earnestness towards the object of obtaining the same grace for his beloved ones: and very soon we find him begging prayers and pilgrimages for that end from all about him. The good nun who had composed the words of his "Cantiques" and from whom he received much sympathy, suggested that his sister, Madame R., should be engaged as teacher of music at the convent school to which the nun belonged, in order to facilitate their holy designs upon her soul. Their arrangements were duly made, and Mère Pauline's influence soon made itself felt over the sensitive Jewish lady; while "Père Augustin" kept her au courant of the more spiritual agencies set on foot by his loving solicitude. "If you only knew all that is being done in the diocese for the conversion of my family," he writes to her; "besides a large number of general communions in various seminaries and convents, nearly 600 persons went on pilgrimage to Notre Dame de Peyragude, besides the whole of our community and the neighboring clergy. From four o'clock in the morning until midday the Communions never ceased. I myself gave 150 at my own Mass."

How efficacious these prayers were found to be may be learned from the fact that eighteen years afterwards Père Augustin returned to the same shrine to give thanks for the conversion of no less than ten members of his family. Very soon after the first pilgrimage his dearly loved sister came to visit him with her husband and child, and long and earnest were his pleadings with her. After hearing her brother preach on the Mystery of the Holy Trinity she came to him and said, "I know now that I shall be damned if I do not embrace the Catholic faith; but I prefer to be damned [damnée] rather than be separated from my George (her only child), and I am certain that he would be taken from me should I

become a Catholic!" Not knowing what to answer her, as he afterwards wrote, her brother turned round and exclaimed, "Oh, how will you dare to go back to Mère Marie Pauline and let her know that you believe and yet have not the courage to confess it?" She hesitated, began to argue again, and finally faltered "If I can be baptized without my husband's knowledge, I want to be a Christian before returning to Paris." It was done as she desired; Madam R—— received the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist from her brother's hands, on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, June 19th, and a few days afterwards the R—— family returned to Paris, little guessing that one of their number had become *a follower of the Nazarene*. From the moment of her reception into the Church, her only son, little George, a child of seven years old, began to show a most ardent desire to become a Christian, and, as we shall see later, he became a veritable little confessor of the faith, while his mother, of whose conversion he like the rest of the family was unaware, became so strengthened with the "Bread of the strong," which in Paris she was able to receive almost daily, that she was enabled to suffer for Christ's sake the long dreaded separation to avert which, in those first days of darkness, she had been even willing to imperil her soul.

Three years after this event, while preaching the Advent sermons at Lyons, Père Hermann received the news of his mother's death. She passed away in silence—a Jewess outwardly as she had lived; no sign of hope had come to console the devoted son who for more than eight years had unceasingly besieged Heaven with his prayers on her behalf. His family, sisters, brother, father, all were dear, but the mother above all, she to whom he owed his life, who had watched and nursed and cared for him with almost more than mother's love all through that time of worldliness and vanity when he had had no care for himself or her; of all souls that soul was the one for which he was ready to give all that he might gain it to eternal life; and she had died, and made no sign. His superiors sent him to Paris to console his family; and he found words, in the midst of his own grief, to win others to repentance, in a penetrating discourse on "The Sorrow of Loss Through Death." Speaking some time later to the venerable Curé d' Ars, of his trouble in knowing that his mother had died unbaptised, the holy man let fall an unlooked for word of encouragement. "Hope on," said he, "you will one day receive, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, a letter which will give you great consolation." Six years after his mother's death, and when these words were all but forgotten, a Jesuit Father handed to Père Hermann a letter addressed to himself, the writer of which was absolutely unknown to him. Its contents were to the effect

that the writer, believing herself to be on her deathbed, wished to inform him of a communication she had received, during the first solemn moments after receiving the Holy Communion one day, from our Lord Himself. He reminded her of a conversation which she had held on the previous evening with a pious friend who expressed her surprise that our Lord should have remained deaf to the prayers of Père Hermann for his mother, "He who has promised to accord all that is asked in prayer." He desired her to tell that friend "that all prayer which has My glory and the salvation of souls for its object is always answered when it possesses the necessary qualities"; and, by a divine inspiration, he made known to her in an inexplicable manner, what had taken place at the death of Madame Cohen. She saw as in a vision the dying Jewess about to draw her latest breath, while Mary the Mother of Divine grace, prostrate before her Son, claimed that soul as her own. She saw grace from the Heart of Jesus leave its source, and touch the heart of the dying woman; and heard the last cry of her soul, "Jesus, God of the Christian, God Whom my son adores, I believe, I hope in Thee, have mercy upon me!" And as she uttered these words, her spirit fled. So was the prediction of the Curé d'Ars accomplished—a circumstance remarkable in itself even were the contents of the letter unimportant or unworthy of credence.

The peculiar circumstances of his conversion, no less than his former renown as a musician and his present eloquence as a preacher, made Père Hermann much sought after as missionary and preacher; and ill and suffering as he always was, sometimes obliged entirely to lie by, and at others, emerging from his sick-room merely to conduct some retreat or effect some unlooked-for conversion, and then retire again for further suffering "*toujours très souffrant en mon cerveau et de mes nerfs*," as he writes, "*et ces souffrances ne sont pas les moindres de mes joies*," he yet passed a great—we may say the greater part of his life as a religious in active apostolic labors. Truly apostolic, for as he himself remarked, his vocation seemed, like that of St. Paul, to be that of planting while others watered. Besides the Lyons foundation, to which we have referred, he built the church and installed the Père Carmes of Bagnères de Bigorne in the following manner: Mère Marie des Anges, prioress and founder of a Carmelite convent there, had longed for years for the establishment of a monastery from which her nuns might receive the spiritual advantages of the near neighborhood of religious directors living under the same rule as themselves. Père Hermann, who was sent to Bagnères by his physician for medical treatment at the then much-frequented baths there, learned her desire, and immediately

saw how advantageous a position it would be for his harvest of souls, being frequented in the summer by thousands of visitors as a health resort. Aided by some generous donations, he began the work. In three years' time the magnificent church was completed, and proved a source of blessing to many and many a soul. The Bagnérais still tell of how, in those palmy days of their now deserted town, the Carmelite church was ever thronged with a fashionable, yet devout, congregation, crowding to hear the once famous pianist Hermann as he preached at vesper hour and then retired to send forth solemn chords on the splendid organ, made by one of the first manufacturers of the day, Cavallè & Col; while the bell-like notes of a hardly less famous tenor, who had followed Père Hermann into the cloister, rang through the echoing aisles. All this is silent now; frescoes painted, or at least begun by Horace Vernet, as an act of friendly homage to Père Hermann; statues, fresh from the hand of Bonassieu the sculptor; the simple grandeur of altars, confessionals ever crowded, from which none were ever sent away, all are now closed to the faithful. Not many months since, the writer, passing that melancholy gateway on which a faded wreath witnesses the death-blow given to faith in many a heart which might have knelt before those altars and received pardon, caught the faint sound of chanting within; and faithful women, lingering to listen, whispered: "It is the Fathers who sing their office—the feast of St. Teresa." So behind doors closed by the seal of the Republic, the house of the Lord awaits His re-entering. "Nothing has gone well with us since les Pères Carmes left," murmur the townsfolk, thinking of the day when, before a scared and silent crowd, the gendarmerie presented themselves before the monastery door, and "in the name of the Republic," the hands that had given bread to the hungry, the lips that had spoken consolation and pardon to the sinner, the feet that were ever ready to serve the sorrowful and the afflicted, were driven out like sheep into the wide world amid insult and scorn. The crowd murmured, especially the rude mountain shepherds who loved the good Fathers, and were indignant at their departure; but the officials threatened *artillery from Tarbes*, and they were cowed and silenced. The too pusillanimous inhabitants of the little town have even now reaped their reward in the almost total cessation of visitors to their baths. Its streets are deserted, shops empty or even closed, and the big casino, built to tempt the turning stream, has proved a failure.

But to return to Père Hermann. Perhaps one of the most thrilling scenes in his varied and eventful life, both to himself and to his auditors, was the hour when he first ascended the pulpit of St. Sulpice to preach by request before the Archbishop of Paris,

and a congregation composed of all that was most fashionable and intellectual alike in that city. For it was in Paris that he had formerly lived his public life as an artist; that he had taken his place in the concert-room with Liszt and Mario, and in the salons of literature and art with George Sand and La Mennais. It was the Parisian world which had first learned to smile indulgence on le petit Puzzi, or whisper wild stories and crazy anecdotes of the authoress and her darling. In fine, he had lived his unconverted life before the eyes of the world in Paris, and now, with the delicacy of a newly-awakened conscience, he felt deeply the need of reparation when he now once more, as a tonsured monk, stood before them. An immense crowd had gathered and filled every nook and corner of the church to hear the celebrated convert speak his first words as a Christian in their midst, and an audible murmur ran through that vast assembly as the white-cloaked monk lifted his grand yet humble brow, and with one keen glance round the expectant assembly, began to speak:

"My brethren, my first act on appearing in this Christian pulpit must be to make reparation for the scandal which, in the past, I had the misfortune to give in this city. You may well ask 'by what right do you come to preach to us, to exhort us to virtue, you whom we have seen among public sinners, prostrate in the pollution of shameless immorality, you who made open profession of error, you who have shocked our gaze by your ill-conduct.' 'Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach?' Yes, brethren, I confess that I have sinned against heaven and before you, and that I have no right to your consideration. Therefore have I come clothed in the garb of penance, bound to an order of severity, with shaven head and bare feet," . . . here he recounted the history of his conversion, winding up with "God, my brethren, has forgiven me, Mary has forgiven me, . . . my brethren, will not you forgive me too?"

Then, turning to a group of young men, he reminded them that his life had been even as theirs, and opening his arms he implored them to follow him and share his happiness. At the close of his sermon he was followed from the church by a young artist, Bernard Bauer, till then unknown to him, who had lately renounced Judaism for Christianity, and now came to announce to Père Hermann that like himself he had "chosen the better part," and would follow him into the solitude of Carmel.

The order of discalced, or barefooted Carmelites, is divided into three branches; the religious who go forth as missionaries into heathen lands, the "mission strangers" of France; the ordinary Fathers who lead a semi-active, semi-contemplative life; and the hermit-brethren or inhabitants of the desert, modern representa-

tives of the Cenobites of old. One can scarcely realize that in the midst of our bustling nineteenth century any "deserts" should still exist capable of containing hermit life; yet we are assured that such is the case, and moreover that the Carmelite constitutions prescribe the formation of a hermitage "as far as possible one in each province." Their object is, as also there set forth, the practice of intercessory prayer, so that while others preach and fight and teach and gather in souls, their hermit-brethren offer up continually prayers, watches, penances and other good works, to be applied to their brethren. Here, too, the more active brethren may retire for a space to revivify their devotion and renew their strength; and of all the foundations and other works in which Père Hermann's hand was active, none was so near his heart as the "desert" which he helped to found, "le saint desert de Tarasteix." The property which contains it, a vast extent of undulating and well-wooded ground, was bought by Père Augustin on behalf of his Order in December, 1856, and from time to time he visited and watched its progress, tracing with his own hands the limits of its foundation, begging everywhere for funds, and overcoming by his energy a thousand obstacles which threatened its success.

An immense building, constructed on the Carthusian principle of separate dwellings under one roof, each habitation complete in itself, now crowns the highest of the little cluster of hills which forms "the desert;" their occupants happily peaceful in perpetual silence, perpetual solitude, and uninterrupted contemplation and prayer; while, scattered here and there among the surrounding woods, some humble huts receive those who crave after still more absolute loneliness.

But to return to the Cohen family. Our readers will remember the conversion of Madame R——, the dearly loved sister of Père Hermann, through the combined influence of himself and the good nun Mère Marie Pauline, and how she trembled at the thought of separation from her little George, her only child. Six years afterwards, his good uncle was enabled to write in full the history of a conversion as touchingly beautiful as that of any of the child confessors or martyrs of early Christian times.

When Madame R——, with her husband and child, went to Agen to visit her brother, that visit which ended in her reception into the Church, while the mother debated and argued over her doubts, her young son was, with something more than mere childish curiosity, examining with the keen interest of boyhood, what to him was a new and surprising phase of life. It was the time of the Fête-Dieu; a feast which in those days, under the Second Empire, little Christian perhaps, but at all events far different from the present infidel and persecuting times, was celebrated with all

the pageantry which Church and State together could offer in homage to the grand and solemn mystery of the Holy Eucharist. What stately festivities have we not witnessed, rich in waving banners and golden vestments, flower-decked streets and brilliant *reposoirs*, the kneeling multitude constrained to at least external homage, while the presence of such regiments as might be stationed near added to the general effect! It is well that such things should be; that the world should in some degree be forced to worship its hidden King. Alas! it is only in remoter districts now that the old-time processions still retain anything of their ancient splendor. At Agen, then, while Madame R—— and her family stayed there, was celebrated the Fête Dieu, the Feast of Corpus Christi. Little George, we may suppose, had made the acquaintance of some boys of his own age in the town, for when the great procession of the feast, with its gaily decked *reposoirs* and waving banners were about to traverse the crowded streets, he, by dint of who knows what childish persuasiveness or bribes, succeeded in inducing one of the choir boys of about his own height to lend him his red cassock and white cotta and to allow him to walk in the procession in his stead. Whether this was done from boyish sportiveness or dawning devotion we cannot tell; certain it is that on that day the seeds of faith were sown in his young heart. He ran home beaming with delight. "Oh, father, father!" he cried, "what happiness! Do you not know? I have been scattering flowers before the good God!"

It was a confession of faith, and the father, startled into alarm, vowed he would remain no longer in that dangerous place, and carried them all back hurriedly to Paris, little guessing that his wife had already been secretly received into the Christian Church. Children are proverbially keen observers, and little George soon began to remark that his mother was in some way changed. Although she dared not, even to her child, acknowledge herself a Christian, she talked much to him of heavenly things, and soon he learned from her lips the mysteries of the faith, while from the grace which had fallen on his soul through the presence of the Holy Eucharist he seemed to have reaped a spirit of devotion most marvellous in so young a child. His uncle tells us that he would wait until his father was asleep (he slept beside him) to rise and pray to the Holy Child Jesus. "Oh my Jesus," he would whisper, "when shall my fast be at an end, when shall I be able to receive Thee in Holy Communion and hold Thee to my heart?" And then he would study his little catechism so as to be quite ready when the longed for hour should come. He was much perplexed at the change in his mother, and one day said to her: "Swear to me that you are not baptized, otherwise I shall believe that

you are!" She did not answer, and he continued: "Ah, mamma, I see, you *are* a Christian! And I hope that Jesus will soon unite me to you, but at least I hope that you have *waited for me* for your first Communion." The trembling mother could keep silence no longer; she whispered to her child that almost daily she received her Saviour. He burst into tears. "Oh, why not have waited for me? Then let me stay very close to you when Jesus is in your heart that I may be near Him. Darling mother, I beg you to keep for me something out of your Communion; you know a mother is always ready to share her own food with her children."

Poor child! Yet not poor, but rich in faith and love. For four long years he lived thus, with no other consolation than the companionship of his trembling mother, watching his little comrades in the Churches as they made their First Communion, and rejoiced in all the privileges of their Christian birth, so little understood sometimes, so little valued. Many would pass by the childish figure half hidden in a corner of his parish church where he would creep in to weep in secret and watch with hungry eyes some groups of white-robed First Communicants, little guessing at the source of his very obvious grief. At last he could bear it no longer—he declared to his mother that he would go and demand baptism from any priest he came across if she did not help him to become a Christian. So, after much deliberation, Père Hermann came up to Paris, secretly, and prepared to receive his little nephew into the Fold of Christ. It was a touching scene. The mother, trembling and agitated, fearing lest her husband should discover them; the witnesses, grave and interested; the uncle-priest by whose prayers this new lamb had been led to its Shepherd; and the child himself, calm, joyous, collected, kneeling in their midst.

"Child, what do you ask?"

"Baptism."

"But know you not, my child, that to-morrow perchance you may be forced to enter a synagogue and participate in its worship?"

"Do not fear, uncle, I abjure Judaism."

"But if they should threaten you and force you to trample on the Crucifix in hatred of our Redemption?"

"Do not be afraid, uncle, I will die rather than do it. Only," he continued anxiously, "if they should tie my feet and hands and carry me into the synagogue and place my feet upon the Crucifix, would that be apostasy, if my will resisted?"

"No, my child, it is the will only which constitutes sin."

"Then I demand baptism. In pity, in pity, give it to me!"

The ceremony continued amid profound emotion. First the Sacrament of Baptism, then Holy Mass and then his First Com-

munion, kneeling between mother and godmother, but unconscious of them and the whole world, rapt in an ecstasy of holy joy.

Some weeks afterwards came the hour of trial. His father, who doubtless had had his suspicions roused, put a Jewish prayer-book into his hands and said to him : " Let us pray."

" Father, I cannot pray in this book of Israelites."

" Why ?"

" I am a Christian, I am a Catholic !"

" Child, you are playing, not talking seriously ; you know quite well that your ' baptism ' would not be valid without your father's consent !"

" I beg your pardon, father, in our holy religion it suffices to be at a reasonable age and have faith and instruction to be validly baptized."

His father said no more for the moment, but a few days later he took George away from his mother and disappeared with him. It was what she had dreaded from the first. Every effort was made by her friends, civil and political authority freely used to discover the place to which the child had been taken, but in vain. Long afterwards it was known that he had been taken into a Protestant country, and there, hundreds of miles away, placed in a heretic school under an assumed name. Here, as he wept and begged to see his mother, " You shall see her," they answered, " if you will first abjure Christianity." " Oh no," replied the sobbing child again and again, " I am a Christian ; I am a Catholic ; I will suffer anything rather than give up my faith."

So he stood firm ; yet his jailers, with a refinement of cruelty, wrote to the mother that he had returned to Judaism.

Three months passed thus ; the mother alone, anxious and sorrowful, having for consolation only her daily communion. The child, still more desolate, deprived of all means of grace, far away in a foreign land. At last a letter came from Germany summoning her to her son. She hastened to the address indicated, a long and toilsome journey, and found her family awaiting her, but—no George ! " My son, where is my son ?" she cried. " You will not see your son until you take an oath to bring him up a Jew," was the reply. A few weeks later, however, her husband so far relented as to allow her few minutes sight of her boy, in his presence, on the express condition that no word on the subject of religion should be uttered. The interview was sad, yet sweet to her heart. Little George threw himself into his mother's arms with sobs and tears, and she clasped him silently to her heart. " He was not able to tell me anything," she wrote to her brother, " but I understood, I felt, that he remained faithful. Yes, I read in his looks, in his tender kisses, that my boy is still a Christian."

From this time apparently Madame R—— continued to reside in the same town where her son was at school, and they met occasionally. "He has found his mother, but where will he find his Jesus?" writes Père Hermann, referring to the fact that in all that town there was not a single Catholic Church or priest who could, even if it had been otherwise possible, have brought little George the consolation of the Sacraments. But God would not leave the heroic young confessor desolate. One day as he was playing by himself in a neighboring wood, where he had, perhaps designedly, strayed from his companions, a stranger gentleman, grave yet kindly of mien, chanced to cross his path. They stop, with mutual looks of inquiry and recognition. "You are George R——?" he queries; and then tells him that he is a missionary priest in disguise, sent by Madame R—— to help and comfort her child.

The happy boy is at last able to make his long-deferred confession, and drink in the words of consolation and encouragement so lovingly proffered. But about Holy Communion? Yes, this too is promised; and they plan and arrange, and pray that all may go well; and a few days later the same good priest, bearing concealed upon his person the Sacred Host and disguised as before, crosses again the Elbe in a crowded excursion steamer, and going to Madame R——'s house where, in her own room she had managed to make a little altar with flowers and lights, he found there the son with his mother, and gave him thus his Easter Communion.

As the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, so the constancy of her confessors is her most fruitful Apostolate; and not long after the persecution to which little George had been subjected was relaxed, one of his mother's brothers presented himself to be received into the Christian Church, saying to his brother Hermann that "a religion which gives such strength to a child must be divine, and that is the reason why I wish to become a Catholic." His elder brother had already become a Christian, and had borne almost the entire expense of erecting a church at Hambourg, where he was baptized; but the father remained bitter against the Church, and in the first outburst of his wrath against Hermann had cursed and disinherited him. One is glad to learn that he consented to forgive and see him on his death-bed, and though dying as he had lived, a Jew, was able to say as he pressed his son's hand in a last farewell, "I forgive thee the three great faults of thy life; having become a Catholic, converted thy sister, and baptized thy nephew!"

In 1855, while Père Augustin-Marie was preaching the Advent sermons at the Cathedral of Lyons, he received an offer from a rich silk merchant, one who had risen from the position of

simply a workman to the head of the trade, of 10,000 francs as a "foundation stone," if his Order would establish a branch in that city. The offer was accepted, and we have seen Père Augustin, with his Semitic brethren, at the ceremony of consecration. It was but one of many like works; for, during the thirty years of his religious life he who so loved and yearned after solitude lived a life of literally incessant movement, going from one place to another, north, south, east, west; here to preach a mission, there to give a retreat, or beg for funds for some new foundation or work of charity. Some one who met him—where indeed he was constantly seen—at a railway station, asked him in all seriousness:

"But, Father, where do you reside?"

"In the train," he answered with a smile; and truly such a life was not the least part of his penance. He was said to divide his life between the train and the pulpit—he, whose one longing had ever been to pray out his life in his beloved desert, the solitude of Tarasteix. But, as the holy Curé d' Ars had prophesied to him, "You do well, indeed, to help in founding a desert, but you will profit little by it yourself." The inhabitants of Lyons, hard-headed men of business and "red" republicans as they were, seem to have been enthusiastically, almost passionately, devoted to him, and his influence among them was unbounded. When he stayed there, the people would throw themselves on their knees as he passed, to ask his blessing, so that he dreaded, in his humility, to go out on foot. One day, having to go some distance, he took a *voiture de place*, and kept it for several hours, going from place to place. When he came to pay his fare on alighting at the convent, "*Pay me, Father?*" cried the driver indignantly, "No, never! Give me your blessing, and I shall be happy!" And not a sou would the good man accept.

Over and over again he was brought to the death-bed of some unrepentant sinner, whose blasphemies were turned, by one word from his lips, into tears of penitence.

In 1879 he established the "Confraternity of Thanksgiving" already alluded to, which in very few years numbered 20,000 Associates, and was enriched by Pius IX. with many indulgences. It is said that he presented so long a list of these, that the Pontiff with his well-known gaiety exclaimed, "But, Father, you are asking for *half Paradise!*" "Holy Father, you hold the keys of it!" responded Hermann with gentle insistence. And he obtained his indulgences.

On a later visit to Rome, in 1862, he met Cardinal Wiseman there, and this dignitary was so struck with Père Augustin's marvellous apostolic gifts, that he begged of the Superior General of

the Carmelites to lend him to the English Mission. The General refused, the Cardinal appealed to the Pope, and Hermann was sent to England. On bidding him farewell the Pontiff exclaimed "My son I bless you and send you to convert England as in the fifth century one of my predecessors blessed and sent the monk Augustin." When he left Paris to enter upon his mission to England, he is described as being, like the first Apostles, "without cloak or raiment or money in his purse"; he literally had no money to pay his journey, and was obliged to beg for some from his friends to enable him to start. He raised, literally by begging, 160 francs, and with this he went to London to re-introduce the Carmelite order.

In the days of his artistic celebrity he had been well-known in the great world of London; and the rumor soon went that Hermann the converted pianist had arrived. People flocked to hear him, crowded to visit him, and by degrees subscriptions for the new church were set on foot. The first little band of monks came together in a house belonging to the Assumption Convent in Kensington, where a small room, converted into a chapel, became the nucleus of wide-spread labors. He preached in English, confessed in German, catechised the children of the neighborhood and gave retreats to the clergy of the diocese, and introduced his beloved "Adoration Nocturne."

Some of our readers may remember the beautiful story of St. Catherine of Siena and the young knight whom by her prayers and exhortations she converted and accompanied to the scaffold, placing his head with her own hands under the knife. "I knelt by his side, and reminded him of the Blood of the spotless Lamb. His lips murmured the words 'Jesus and Catherine.' Then the knife fell, and I received his head in my hands." The story has been immortalized in painting by the hand of Pinturichio, but no nineteenth-century artist has yet attempted to portray a companion picture—that of Hermann the monk on a like scaffold.

One day—it was in 1864—eight Spanish sailors, imprisoned in Newgate, were condemned to death for murder at sea. Père Hermann, together with one of his brothers, the master of novices, who was a Spaniard, was called upon to give them spiritual assistance, and for fifteen days they visited them daily. Finally, three were reprieved and five condemned to the gallows, four of whom were Catholics; and Père Hermann afterwards in a speech before the Conference at Malines, gave a thrilling description of their last moments. He told how, after fifteen days of loving, earnest pleading, these poor souls had been touched with the grace of repentance, and from raging demons became transformed into most humble penitents. On the morning of the execution

he passed through a crowd of 30,000 men and women, who had stationed themselves the whole night through before that terrible gallows to see their fellow-men die, bearing concealed upon his breast the Holy Eucharist. "Never, in all my thirteen years of priesthood," he declared, "have I so strikingly seen exemplified the efficacious power of the Eucharist and the priesthood. For two long hours those young souls—the eldest was not more than 26 years old, talked—as they waited for the moment of death, with the sounds of howling and hooting outside breaking ever and anon upon their ears—of the joys and glories of Paradise, of the love of God and of the forgiveness of Jesus—till the grim procession of officials appeared to conduct them to the scaffold. One last grace they requested, 'to have our priests beside us to the end,' and, contrary to prison rules, this was granted them. Père Hermann and his brother priest, like St. Catherine of old, mounted the scaffold beside the row of pinioned criminals, who had to face not only the supreme terror of the gallows, but also that almost more unnerving sight, the sea of 30,000 upturned, expectant, pitiless human faces, all eager to see a fellow-man meet his doom. 'Father, Father,' cried one of them, 'do not forsake me!' 'And I stepped up to the fatal plank,' said Père Hermann, 'expecting a howl of execration at the sight of a Catholic priest and of rosaries and crucifixes with which they were armed. But no; 'Hats off!' was the only cry; and as they stood there, one of the condemned ones wrenching asunder the ropes which bound his arms, lifted his right hand full in view and blessed himself on forehead, lips, and heart, then beating his breast three times he cried out *the only English word he knew*, 'Pardon! Pardon! Pardon!' A murmur of sympathy ran through the crowd—the sheriff made a sign—and the next moment all was over. The Spanish priest who accompanied Père Hermann was forced to detach his own crucifix from the lips of one of the criminals as the drop fell, so closely did they accompany these penitents. It was afterwards remarked—and recorded in the *Times* newspaper—that the faces of four out of the five—and they were the four Catholics—were, contrary to the general result of such death, calm, peaceful, almost smiling. 'Their very bodies,' commented Père Hermann, 'were as it were embalmed by the Blessed Eucharist.'

The record of Père Augustin's apostolic labors at this time becomes almost bewildering in the rapidity of his movements. One day he is in London gathering worshipers round the Blessed Sacrament, the next in Berlin giving Holy Communion, at the close of a retreat, to more than seven thousand persons; again at Lyons for a Triduum, at Rouen, Rennes, Paris, Passay le Monial, Ireland, Rome; everywhere sermons, retreats, missions without end, in spite of weak health and almost constant suffering.

"Only fancy," writes Soeur Natalie Marischkin in a letter given in Mrs. Craven's charming life of her, "for a fortnight we have had Father Hermann here. You have heard of his conversion in 1847, but if you only knew how strongly and continually grace works in his soul you would join us in thanking God for it. My dear companions are electrified and penetrated by the perfume of his virtues. . . . This Father's presence has done us great good; one cannot help being the better for coming into contact with his ardent charity. The impressions he leaves behind him are quite peculiar." He on his side declared that "she was one of the most beautiful souls in the Church," but neither of them guessed as they thus mutually edified each other that it was a Sister of her own Order, that of St. Vincent de Paul, who was ere long to minister to him upon his death-bed in exile and receive his latest breath.

At last he found himself at liberty to fulfil what had had been for many years the desire of his heart—to retire to "the holy desert of Tarasteix, the ante-chamber of heaven." It was entered with much ceremony, a reception almost like that of profession to the religious life; and once admitted the soul which yearned for solitary and uninterrupted converse with its God might well hope to be "forgotten by the world." But in his case such was not to be. The strain of overwork in the past now took effect, and brought on a serious ophthalmic affection which necessitated special treatment; and after consulting the physicians, under obedience, he resolved to try rather supernatural than natural means, and went to Lourdes to ask for a cure. After a novena at his own convent of Bagnere de Bigorne, he crossed, on foot, the quiet mountain pass which leads from the valley of Bagneres to that smiling plain, gently undulating on either side of the rushing Gave where nestles the quiet country townlet which has become the centre of a world-wide pilgrimage; and bathing in the healing waters beside the Grotto, he rose from his knees to echo the cry of many another pilgrim heart, "*Je suis guéri!*"

It was not, as we may well imagine, his first visit to Lourdes. Long years before, when the Grotto was guarded by soldiers, and Bernadette an object of suspicion, he had prayed there and received the grace of release from a troublesome neuralgic affection, and had congratulated the inhabitants with his usual warm fervor on their present blessedness and future glories; and watched, with paternal interest, the holy retirement of the favored peasant girl, and the growth of devotion to Our Lady under her new title, she in whose own mouth he had received the grand first grace of conversion, and "through whom" as he wrote, "he had found Jesus."

Again, after his cure, for a brief while he returned to his beloved desert, but the holy soul who had revealed to him his mother's dying conversion, now sent him a second message: "Tell Père Hermann that he may not remain in the desert, he must fight." And presently the order came to return to active life as First Definitor of the Province and Master of Novices.

For he was to die in harness. It was the year 1870 which first saw him ruling the novitiate at Broussey, and in the autumn of that year came Sedan, and Metz, and all the horrors and hatreds of war. Hermann Cohen was a German by birth, and though privileged to remain in the land of his adoption, he feared to compromise his brethren by his presence among them at a time when convents were pillaged and monasteries razed for slighter cause; so, resigning his post with the heroic unselfishness which ever characterized him, he paid one last visit to his well-loved desert, and to his foundations, Bagneres and Carcassonne, and then passed on into Switzerland, the refuge of political fugitives, warmly welcomed by its chief pastor, Monsignor Mermillod.

This venerable prelate, true patriot as well as zealous lover of souls, was just at that time grieving over the sad condition of hundreds of French soldiers who, imprisoned in German fortresses, suffered grievously both in body and soul. They were not permitted to see a priest of their own nation, and the thought came like an inspiration to Monsignor Mermillod, "Suppose Pere Hermann, a German by birth, a Frenchman in heart and soul, well known at Berlin and personally acquainted with the Queen of Prussia, were to offer his services?" Hermann accepted the suggestion, set off for Berlin, and placing his services at the disposal of the authorities, was nominated chaplain of the fortress of Spandau, near the capital, where 6000 French prisoners were interned. What his labors were here those only who know the heart of an apostle can fathom; how night and day he was among them, bringing comfort to their bodies and healing to their souls; how he preached, confessed, communicated them in ceaseless iteration, procured warm clothing for their suffering bodies, and preached penitence to their souls. It was not for long. Among the sick no less than 300 in the hospital were laid low under the scourge of small-pox. Worn out with labors and weakened by incessant strain, the weary frame was open to infection, and in administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction to two dying men he caught the disease. A neighboring priest was summoned to his bedside and expressed the hope that God would yet spare him to his work. "Well, *no*," he replied, clasping his crucifix with weak and trembling fingers. "I hope that God will take me this time."

"Yet I should have liked," he murmured some days later, "to

work on and gain more souls for Jesus." It was his only regret. Later in the same evening he received his viaticum, blessed, with dying breath, the nursing Sisters who ministered to him; "And now, oh, my God, into Thy Hands I commend my spirit;" a few hours of fainter and fainter breathing, and his noble, tender soul had entered his Master's Presence.

Sœur Natalie gave, in writing to one of her correspondents, a beautiful account of his last moments. "I longed to tell you what we have heard of the last moments of the saintly Father Hermann. One of our Sisters had the privilege of ministering to him during his illness and witnessing his end. When he felt that he was dying, he asked her if she could sing the 'Te Deum.' 'No, she could not.' 'And the Salve Regina?' 'Oh, yes,' she replied. 'Then let us sing it together;' and he began the antiphon with her. As they went on with it the voice of the dying saint became weaker and weaker, and then ceased to be heard—he was dead. Oh, what an end, dear Sister! If ever I was tempted to the sin of envy, it was from the wish to have been in that privileged Sister's place!"

THEODORA L. L. TEELING.



CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

No. 2. THE PROPHECY—THE OFFER—THE ACCEPTANCE.

WHILE the studies of Columbus were chiefly of a scientific character, the motives which impelled him to undertake the discovery of the New World were chiefly religious. The extension of the realms of Christendom, the conversion of the heathen natives to Christianity, the exaltation of the Saviour's name on earth and the spread of the Church, were the grand objects he aimed to accomplish. When success crowned his gigantic efforts, and boundless revenues were his due, the other sublime purpose of restoring the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Lands to the Christians, became the paramount object of his burning thoughts, desires and sacrifices. Having been from childhood and through life a devout and earnest Christian, he was well acquainted with Christian interests, duties and dogmas. But when he felt his providential and apostolic mission developing in his mind and heart, he devoted himself with extraordinary industry, zeal and enthusiasm, to the study of the Scriptures, the history of the Church, the dogmas of Christianity, Christian Philosophy and Theology, and Christian civilization. These chastening studies prepared him for his great mission, and when he came to plead the cause of the New World in the Council of Salamanca, composed chiefly of ecclesiastics and greatly less of navigators and mariners, he seemed like a prophet in the flesh by reason of his ecclesiastical, scriptural and sacred learning and by the power of his arguments and eloquence. So, also, when between his third and fourth voyages, he pleaded with the Spanish sovereigns the cause of the Holy Sepulchre, the wisest and most learned theologians and divines could add nothing to his sublime knowledge and application of the prophecies, the gospels and the patristic theology. He boldly asserted that his double mission had been foretold in the divine prophecies. He felt this inspiration through many years of his life, long before he presented it in public in connection with the proposals he made for the discovery of the New World, and he defended his position with the learning of a seer, the inspiration of a prophet, and the zeal of an apostle.

Many learned divines have maintained, with Columbus, that his mission and its results were foretold by the Prophets, and many texts of Scripture are referred to as indicating or pointing to the great discoverer. It has been claimed that in the Holy Scriptures

no less than nine different passages are distinctly applicable to the discovery of the New World by Columbus, and many have admirably seen in Holy Writ descriptions of his ships and even of his armorial ensigns. While Cardinal Ximenes, who acted as intermediary between the admiral's son and successor, Don Diego Columbus and the Emperor Charles V., evinced appreciation of his divine mission, the able and pious Diego de Deza, Archbishop of Seville, supported the pretensions of the admiral, publicly and privately. The illustrious Cardinal Valerio, in his great work "*De Consolatione Ecclesiæ*," seems by the strongest implication to venerate and praise the providential character of the man. The Count Roselly de Lorgues names a long list of eminent historical and religious personages, including Maluenda, Thomas Bozius, Ponce de Leon, Bolera, Father Thomas of Jesus, Solerzano Herrera, who espoused the same view. The learned Father Acosta sees in numerous passages of the prophet Isaias direct references to the discovery of America, especially in the sixty-sixth chapter. It would be impossible to recount the numerous opinions, and still less the countless passages, which have been thus regarded and quoted. A selection of the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22d, and 23d verses of the 66th chapter of Isaias referring to the call of the Gentiles, will suffice as curious examples, among many others:

"18. But I know their works, and their thoughts; *I come that I may gather them together with all nations and tongues; and they shall come and shall see my glory.*

"19. And I will set a *sign among them, and I will send them, that shall be saved, to the Gentiles into the sea, into Africa and Ly-dia, them that draw the bow; into Italy and Greece, to the islands afar off, to them that have not heard of me, and have not seen my glory. And they shall declare my glory to the Gentiles.*

"20. *And they shall bring all your brethren out of all nations for a gift to the Lord, upon horses and in chariots, and in litters, and on mules, and in coaches, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as if the children of Israel should bring an offering in a clean vessel unto the house of the Lord.*

"21. *And I will take of them to be priests and Levites, saith the Lord.*

"22. *For as the new heavens, and the new earth, which I make to stand before me, saith the Lord; so shall your seed stand and your name.*

"23. *And there shall be month after month, and Sabbath after Sabbath, and all flesh shall come to adore before my face saith the Lord."*

While there are many other passages of the scriptures which equally refer to great events to take place in the future, such as

the inhabitants of the islands and lands of the Gentiles, and to the heathens coming to know and worship the true God, and which are susceptible of a construction pointing to the discovery of the New World, these were all sedulously sought out and carefully collated by Christopher Columbus, and he used them with wonderful effect and admirable skill, in vindicating his theories, in establishing his divine call, and in proving the truth of his predictions.

But there was a tradition, of Christian origin, whose author is unknown, whose source is involved in obscurity, and whose date cannot be fixed, and yet it was regarded as, and has since been cited, by the biographers of Columbus, as proof of the prophetic character he bears in history, and of the prophetic achievements he was to perform. The very name, the symbolism and the office of Columbus were thus presented and handed down in tradition, in the hagiography and martyrology of the Church, in sacred statues and pictures, and in the most splendid window-pictures of the Cathedrals of the Middle Ages. A colossal saint is thus represented in legend, in prayer, and in architecture, whose name was St. Christopher, and whose office was to bear the Christ on his powerful shoulders across the vast waters. St. Christopher was the patronal saint of Columbus. It is true his name appears in the ancient hagiology of the Church, in her martyrology, and Alban Butler gives the sacred tradition. The pagan name of the saint was Orphurus; he was by birth a Syrian, of gigantic strength and stature, and zealous in the service of the powerful king. He became a Christian instantly on witnessing a Christian miracle, and such was his zeal that he insisted upon receiving no other name than Christophorus, the Christ-Bearer, when he received baptism at the hands of St. Babylus, Bishop of Antioch. He carried the Gospel through Palestine, parts of Asia Minor, and travelled constantly, preaching the Word. He was finally arrested during the persecution, under the Emperor Decius, and sealed his faith and services with his blood. The variance between the life and deeds of St. Christopher and the symbolical forms under which he was represented, has attracted much attention. Those symbols represented a Christ-Bearer carrying the Christ over vast seas of water, and they have thus represented the name rather than the deeds of the Syrian martyr. The name and the office have thus been symbolized, and not the life or deeds of the giant saint. The symbols describe in fact the divine vocation, the office and the very achievements of Christopher Columbus, in discovering America, and thus carrying the Christ across a mighty ocean to distant heathen nations. The very resoluteness of Columbus, his indomitable will, his power and strength of argument, conviction, and learning, his gigantic per-

severance under unparalleled delays, obstacles and opposition, point to him through the symbols of St. Christopher. Such, too, was the representation of the saint, from the beginning, even from the fourth century. Thus says the Count Roselly de Lorgues; "The Church welcomed the colossal effigies of St. Christopher, which, in rendering homage to the giant martyr of the Faith, represented the future apostolate of a great man, who would bear 'Christ' in his very name," and we may add who would carry Christ across the vast wilderness of waters to many nations, and as Isaias proclaimed for the Lord, "to them that have not heard of me, and have not seen my glory."

It is also a quite authentic and historical fact, that from the time of the appearance and eminence attained by Christopher Columbus, and his discovery of the New World, the representations of St. Christopher became very much altered. Instead of the colossal saint, the proportions were reduced very much in size, and made to correspond with the probable proportions of Christopher Columbus. It is also interesting to note that in one of the first maps of the New World, perhaps the very first, made, too, by the first geographer contemporaneous with the great discovery, the celebrated Juan de la Cosa, he omitted to place on his map the name of Christopher Columbus as the discoverer of the new countries thus delineated; but in place thereof he painted on the map a representation of St. Christopher, bearing Christ on his shoulders, and in the opinion of M. Ferdinand Denis and of the Count de Lorgues, the features and countenance of the saint were those of Columbus. The latter of these writers argues closely that the images of St. Christopher were only prophetic of Columbus, and that "the prediction contained in this religious image was already realized." The disappearance of St. Christopher now from our churches and cathedrals, the cessation of new dedications in his honor, and the discontinuance of his *cultus*, while the glory and honor of the great admiral and discoverer have reached their height, would indicate the natural order of events, the prophecy replaced by its fulfilment. But St. Christopher, the colossal saint, had been generally venerated in Spain, and it is a significant and curious fact, that from the twelfth century, and perhaps an earlier one, there was a tradition that the very country from which Christopher Columbus went forth with the cross, Catholic Spain, should be the country that was destined to convert the nations that should be discovered. It was Christopher Columbus himself who, after his third voyage, and while pleading for his fourth, sought out and revived this prophetic tradition, in his "Book of Prophecies." Father Acosta, in his "Natural and Moral History of the Indies," has said, with true antiquarian research, "that it had been predicted

for a long time that the New World was to be converted to Jesus Christ by the Spanish nation." Who can say that Columbus had not reason to believe that he and his work had been foretold by prophet and tradition? But ancient and modern poetry had also spoken in even more emphatic terms. In classic Greece and Rome the gift of poetry, with its great scope and liberty, was little removed from the gift of oracles and prophecy, and the oracles of Delphi were issued in the poetic literary form. At all events the poet could safely take the uncertain risk, and if his predictions were verified, he was recognized as a prophet; but if it eventuated otherwise, the thoughts were referred to the poet's license to roam at will in the realms of fancy. And yet, for some purpose of its own, Divine Providence might have bestowed, as in the case of the Sibyl, a prophetic Gift upon the Gentile poet. If, as Columbus and many learned scholars thought, the words of Isaías and other prophets referred to the coming discovery of a New World, and the mystic meaning was left to human ingenuity or genius to detect and interpret, so, too, the classic poet and philosopher, the learned Seneca, of the first half of the first century of the Christian Era, has foretold the discovery of America in verses of no doubtful meaning:

" Venient annis
Sæcula seris, quibus Oceanus
Vincula rerum laxet, et ingens
Pateat Tellus, Typhisque novos
Delegat orbes, nec sit terris
Ultima Thule."—Seneca's *Medea*.

Mr. Joshua Tallman Smith has given us a free translation of the prophecy:

" Naught now its ancient place retains;
Araxes' banks the Indian gains;
The Persian, Elbe and Rhine hath found,
Far from his country's ancient bound,
And ages yet to come shall see
Old Ocean's limits passed and free,
Where lands, wide-stretched, beyond our view lie
Remoter than remotest Thule."

A clearer conception of the poet's mind may be gathered from the following translation of the same:

An age in the dim distant future
Shall the bonds of the Ocean unbind;
Shall open up Earth to its limits,
And Continents new shall it find,
When Ultima Thule has left
But a name or a record behind.

Even the divine Dante became inspired with prophetic sight when he contemplated the possibilities of the earth, and thus, about two centuries before Columbus' great discovery, predicted what would happen :

De' vostri sensi, ch'e de rimanente,
Non vogliate negar l'esperienza,
Dietro al Sol, del Mondo senza gente.
—Dante's *Inferno*, canto 26, v. 115.

These lines have been happily translated by Mr. Carey, the translator of Dante, as follows :

"O brothers, who amid a hundred thousand
Perils," I said, "have come unto the West,
To this so inconsiderable vigil
Which is remaining of your senses still,
Be ye unwilling to deny the knowledge,
Following the sun, of the unpeopled world?"

But another poet who flourished in the very century of Columbus, his contemporary in part, though he did not live to know of the discovery of America, Pulci, of Florence, born in 1431 and deceased in 1487, has, in poetic form, given the world of that century an insight into the coming discovery ; a prophecy which, no doubt, fell under the vigilant eye of the man that fulfilled it. The poet puts the words this time in the mouth of the devil, who is answering Rinaldo, and refuting the general belief that the world ended at the Pillars of Hercules :

"Know that this theory is false ; his bark
The daring mariner shall urge far o'er
The western wave, a smooth and level plain,
Albeit the Earth is fashioned like a wheel,
Man was in ancient days of grosser mould,
And Hercules might blush to know how far
Beyond the limits he had vainly set
The dullest sea-boat soon shall wing her way.
Men shall descry another hemisphere,
Since to one common centre all things tend ;
So Earth, by curious mystery divine
Well balanced, hangs amid the starry spheres.
At our antipodes are cities, states,
And thronged empires, ne'er divined of yore.
But see, the Sun speeds on his western path
To glad the nations with expected light."
—*Morgante Maggiore*, Prescott's Translation.

Here, in these remarkable and spirited words of the poet-prophet we find settled and elucidated with ease and grandeur of conception, the then difficult and abstruse questions which afterwards so much disconcerted the learned Council of Salamanca. The spheri-

city of the earth, the centre of gravity, the antipodes, the hemispheres, continents studded with cities, states and empires, are all described, and the little caravel on board of which Columbus sailed and saw or experienced them all, was "the dullest sea-boat" which the conscious poet predicted would make the fateful voyage. That Columbus carefully sought out and studied every work, every allusion in books, charts and traditions, which in any way bore upon the great subject of his aspirations, is one of the most marked features of his progress towards conviction and confidence. No doubt many passages other than those above mentioned, and many sources of information, were explored by him. He was thoroughly and immovably convinced of the existence of western lands unknown to the civilized world. While all eyes were turned on the African route to the Indies, it was a brave and sublime effort of genius by which Columbus asserted that the New World would be reached by sailing westward across the Atlantic. It was not only the voice of prophetic seers that brought conviction to his mind, and gave great shape to his theories and proposals; it was also, and chiefly, on scientific and practical bases, that he built the splendid structure of his startling announcement. Hence it was, that when Columbus made known his views and proposals, and was challenged with every conceivable and inconceivable objection and defiance, he was well prepared to give the grounds upon which he based them.

First of all he supported his theories upon physical reasons. The evident and demonstrable sphericity of the earth, foreshadowed, as Mr. Winsor says, from a period of six hundred years before Christ by a few leading philosophers, and the consequent existence of the antipodes he firmly asserted. From such data it was manifest that a ship could sail *around* the earth. Measuring the circumference of the earth at twenty-four hours or three hundred and sixty degrees with Ptolemy, and proving by comparison map that fifteen hours of this measurement were known, there remained but eight hours, or one-third of the circumference to be discovered. This space must be filled by the Eastern regions of Asia, and a strip of ocean, which, leaning upon learned authorities, he contended was inconsiderable, could be easily traversed, and thus by sailing westward the lands of Asia must be found. He secondly supported his claim upon the authority of such writers as Aristotle, Seneca, Pliny and Strabo, among the ancients, and of Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville among moderns, and having read from them that Eastern Asia must be opposite Spain and Africa, and a course, taking in Antillia and Cipango, opulent Eastern islands, would easily result in finding Asia. His third argument rested on the reports of experienced navigators. Many signs of the existence of

land westward across the Atlantic had floated to the shores of Europe and Africa, and his memoranda contain many such reports from mariners employed in the Portuguese voyages on the coast of Africa, and from the inhabitants of the Canaries, Madeira, and the Azores. In one instance a piece of carved wood was picked up four hundred and fifty leagues west of Cape St. Vincent, and at Porto Santo a similar token had been drifted ashore from the western Atlantic; huge trunks of pine trees were drifted ashore from the same direction, and even the bodies of two dead men with features different from any known race, were washed ashore on the island of Flores. Many veteran seamen had seen lands and islands to the westward when carried by winds in that direction out of their course. Even the king of Portugal had shown him some gigantic reeds from far off lands. These and innumerable instances and proofs under all three heads were ever ready in his memory for his use in demonstration of his positions. The philosophical grounds, based upon the shape of the earth, its size in hours of fifteen degrees and the consequent size of the land and ocean intervening, furnished his principal argument, and these, though based upon two errors of fact as to the extent of Asia and the surface of intervening ocean, were substantially correct. Mr. Irving considers these as fortunate errors, since by diminishing the distance to be navigated he gave hope of success. Whereas had it been known how much larger was the earth's circumference, and how much vaster the intervening ocean, Columbus could never have induced a government to undertake the task, or a mariner to sail with him. The peculiar manner and gradual succession of his accumulation of proofs show conclusively that he had long been convinced of his theory, and that he had spent many years in thus heaping up proofs to support it. From the first announcement of his theory he spoke with the firmness and certainty of a seer, and he would not concede a point to doubting opponents. Not only was he thoroughly equipped with every weapon of science, tradition and authority, but he came forward prophet-like, imbued with deep religious convictions that he was a chosen emissary of Providence and that Holy Writ and Oracle had equally foretold his mission. Now were the ages gathered together and accomplished, the time long prophesied had come, the man of destiny was girded for the task, and the peoples that had never known the Lord would now see Him and know Him, and adore. It has well been contended by authors with almost universal acclaim, that the idea originated solely in the mind of Columbus, and Mr. Irving with singular ability traces its origin and progress there, and proves that it was a conception of his genius, only quickened by

the impulse of his age and encouraged by a few scattered gleams of knowledge which had never produced a sharpened conviction or even a defined theory in the minds of men. It has remained for Mr. Winsor of Boston to assume that Columbus only executed what had for five hundred years before Christ been handed down among the learned as a definite theory.

The next great event in the life and progress of Columbus was his correspondence with the famous and learned cosmographer of Florence, Dr. Paolo Toscanelli, which occurred in the year 1474. Having heard that Dr. Toscanelli was corresponding with Lorenzo Girardi, a Florentine, then in Lisbon, on the subject of the Portuguese voyages along the African coast towards Asia, and the possibility of western voyages for the same end, circumstances which show that Columbus had long before this been convinced of his Western plan, and had freely spoken of it in Lisbon, Columbus sent to the learned cosmographer a small globe showing the shape of the earth, and especially his views. He addressed two letters to the distinguished cosmographer of Florence, both of which have been unfortunately lost, but the two letters of Dr. Toscanelli to Columbus have fortunately been preserved. It would be interesting to give them at length, in order that we might see, now, at the close of the nineteenth century and four hundred years after the great discovery, how the brightest and most gifted intellects of that period reasoned on the shape and size of the earth, the position and extent of Asia, and how the vast empire of the Grand Khan, whose capital was at Cathay, with its countless millions of subjects, its numerous provinces and tributary kingdoms, its unnumbered cities, could be reached by water. "Do not wonder," writes Dr. Toscanelli, in his letter to Martinez, Canon of Lisbon, a copy of which the former sent to Columbus, "at my calling the regions where the spices are found, west, whilst they are commonly called east; for any one sailing to the west will reach them by a *subterranean* course; but travelling by land and over the earth they are found to the east." And in his letter to Columbus Dr. Toscanelli writes, "I appreciate your grand and noble desire to sail from the east to the west, according to the chart that I sent you, and, as will be better shown by a round sphere. I am glad you understood it, and that the voyage is not only possible, but certain; the honor and profit will be beyond calculation, and the reputation great among all Christians. You can only learn this perfectly from experience and practice, and I have had the surest and fullest information from illustrious and learned men, who came from those parts to the Court of Rome here, and from other merchants—persons of good authority—who traded for a long time in those lands. When that

voyage is made, it will be to powerful kingdoms and noble cities, and provinces abounding with everything we need; with every kind of spices and great plenty of jewels. It will also be to kings and princes most desirous of intercourse with Christians of our land, as well because many of them are Christians, as because they are anxious to meet and converse with the men of our country, who are wise and learned not only in religion, but in all the other sciences, on account of the great reputation of our governments. For which reason, and for many others that I might name, I am not surprised at the courage of your heart, or that the whole Portuguese nation, always distinguished in every enterprise, should be full of enthusiasm for the voyage." It is evident that Toscanelli's impressions of Asia, and his errors also, are based, like those of Columbus, on the writings of Marco Polo, who visited the Eastern countries in 1271 and remained there for eighteen years. The Christians in the East, of whom he writes, must have been the mythical subjects of the mythical Christian Emperor of the East, Prester John, and it is evident that while the king of Portugal was following quite a different route, it was natural that he should ask the Canon of Lisbon to write to the Doctor for an explanation. It is strange that Toscanelli should have considered the western voyage a *subterranean* one, which is an error into which Columbus never fell. It would also seem clear from the fact that Toscanelli states that all Portugal was enthusiastic for the voyage westward, which Columbus proposed, that the latter must have already publicly presented it. While Columbus sent to Toscanelli a globe, Toscanelli sent to Columbus a chart. Toscanelli gives a preference to the globe of Columbus. Columbus eighteen years later, in his first voyage, in which he discovered the New World, carried with him the chart, which Toscanelli had sent him. While it is apparent that Toscanelli confirmed Columbus in his errors, as to countries he would find, and as to the extent of Asia and of the ocean, it is equally certain that he strengthened the convictions of Columbus as to the practicability of his undertaking, expressed his learned and weighty concurrence in his ideas, and fired his heart for the grand expedition. The Admiral's son and historian, Fernando Columbus, has well said, "it made the Admiral still hotter for his discovery." To the learned Florentine is due the credit and honor of giving new impulse to the splendid schemes of Columbus, which were destined to bring to light nations never dreamed of by Marco Polo or Toscanelli, and to change so vastly the geography of the earth. Strange it is to observe the contrast between the opulent countries and empires, and powerful sovereigns, described by Dr. Toscanelli, and the simple Indian caciques and their naked sub-

jects, uncultivated islands and primitive governments, which Columbus actually discovered. While Toscanelli learnedly dreamed, Columbus shaped the spherical earth, brought the antipodes to visit Europe, solved the mysteries which had puzzled Aristotle, and planted the Cross in the New World of his discovery.

Columbus did not make an offer of his discovery immediately, for it was not an undertaking that could be assumed by any individual ; only a government could do so. It is not known why he waited so much longer ; probably his views and proposals were too far in advance of the knowledge and convictions of the age, or even of the Portuguese government, even though Dr. Toscanelli had stated that Portugal was fired with enthusiasm to undertake the voyage. It is even doubtful to what government he first made his offer. An old and not improbable tradition relates that he first proposed the enterprise to his native country, Genoa, from motives of patriotism and generosity. But Genoa was no longer the magnificent Genoa of old ; her power and glory had departed ; she refused, from necessity, the noble proposals of her illustrious son. Venice is also mentioned as the second government to which he presented his plans and by which they were rejected ; but this statement is not regarded as sufficiently authenticated. Portugal had become his adopted country, and gladly would he have broached the subject to Affonso V., king of that nation ; but this monarch was engaged in an expensive and fruitless war in the interests of Princess Juana, then contesting the crown of Castile with Isabella, and Portugal had been also impoverished already by her efforts to discover a route to India by following the coasts of Africa. As the conditions were not favorable in Portugal under Affonso V., Columbus waited until 1481, when John II. had succeeded his father on the throne. In this reign the spirit and enterprise of Prince Henry the Navigator were revived, and the maritime spirit of the Portuguese was rekindled. The king had appointed three learned astronomers and cosmographers to devise a means of freeing ships from the restricted limits of navigation near the coasts and of enabling them to sail and return in unknown seas and under all parts of the heavens, and the result of this auspicious movement was the application of the astrolabe, heretofore used only in astronomy, also to navigation. This was an important invention for the world and especially for Columbus, for now the compass and the astrolabe would enable him to brave the dread Atlantic, the Sea of Darkness, and to guide his ships back to Europe in case either of failure or success.

This enterprise, which he recognized as a heavenly inspiration, pressed urgently upon his mind, and he felt prepared to execute it. He had followed the sea from the age of fourteen, had visited every

known land, had gone even as far as Iceland, the Ultima Thule, in 1447, had studied every science bearing on navigation, and by his visit to the Portuguese fort, St. George at the Mine, under the equinoctial, he had dispelled the popular delusion that the equatorial belt was uninhabitable, by his own personal experience and testimony. Scarcely a living man, if any one, had followed the sea as many years, or traversed as much of the earth, as he. The son of destiny and prophecy was now prepared for the accomplishment.

Columbus, deeming the occasion propitious, made his proposals for the discovery of the western lands over across the Atlantic to the king of Portugal. The conduct of the king was so equivocal as to leave us at a loss to ascertain his motives. Whether he was captivated by the brilliant prospects laid before him, or convinced by the cogent arguments of Columbus, or was merely temporizing, or was desirous to throw off the importunities of one whom he considered visionary, or was at heart anxious to undertake the enterprise, provided he could induce his counsellors to so advise him, and thus share the responsibility, seems involved in doubt and obscurity. Twice he referred the matter to a council of learned men, at court, and twice they reported against it. On the last occasion, Cazadilla, Bishop of Ceuta, was the leading opponent of the proposals, and he, in turn, seeing disappointment and displeasure depicted on the king's countenance, endeavored to recover royal favor by making a suggestion, as unfortunate to his own fame that he should have proposed it, as it was dishonorable to the king, that he should have adopted it.

Some have supposed that Columbus and the king differed only on the terms, the latter being unwilling to grant the lofty and princely concessions which the former demanded from the beginning. However this may be, the king, with Cazadilla and other courtiers, basely asked Columbus for his charts and drawings, in order, as pretended, to consider the subject; and while the latter was only too well pleased to send them to the king in hopes of a better result, the royal trickster and his advisers fraudulently fitted out a caravel with perfect secresy, under the pretence of sending supplies to the Cape Verde Islands, but they really intended, by following the directions laid down in the charts of Columbus, to make the effort to discover the new lands, and thus rob him of all the glory of the discovery. It is difficult to reconcile such perfidy, dishonesty and baseness with the positions and pretensions of those engaged in it. But the fact is unquestioned. The voyage ended in failure as complete as were the dishonor and the perfidy of its perpetrators. The first storm on the Atlantic brought their vain wanderings to an end; they returned chagrined to the Cape

Verde Islands; and they treacherously endeavored to cover their own shame by ridiculing the plans of Columbus as a dream, a fiction, or the fancy of a disordered mind.

Columbus discovered beyond a question this unworthy attempt to wrong him, and he availed himself of the first opportunity of secretly departing forever from Portugal, shaking the dust of that country from his feet. He carried with him his little son Diego. It is supposed that he visited Genoa and gave assistance and comfort to his aged father, his mother being then dead. It is also conjectured by some that he now again, in person, made his proposals to his native city, but with the same result as before. His long delay and struggles with Portugal, and his travels, left him extremely impoverished. In his desperate poverty it is a grand spectacle to see him assisting to his utmost his venerable parent. He was thus actually begging his way from court to court while he held the secret of unknown worlds and of boundless wealth. A year of uncertain events and struggles intervenes in this epoch of his life. He left Portugal towards the end of 1484, and must have arrived in Spain towards the end of the year 1485.

In poverty and distress, weary and travel-worn, the next scene in the remarkable and providential life of this extraordinary man was near the maritime town of Palos, in Andalusia, Spain, where, at the gates of the Franciscan Convent of La Rabida, he and his little son asked for bread and water from the porter of the convent. Father and son were on their way to Huelva to visit his brother-in-law, Muñar, who had married a sister of Doña Felipa Moñi, his wife, with whom he could leave Diego, while he continued his anticipated applications from court to court.

Historians have recognized the hand of Providence in his rejection by Portugal, Genoa and Venice, and in the very poverty which brought him a beggar to the convent gate. It was here he found a friend in cowl and cassock, with more intellect and heart than kings and princes had shown, with more generosity and nobility than the great ones of the earth had possessed. The designs of God in his behalf now began to unfold themselves. An humble monk was the noble instrument of heaven. For at this moment passing by, as the stranger and his boy were refreshing themselves with bread and water, Father Juan Perez de Marchena, the guardian of the convent, was struck with the lofty mien, the intellectual brow, the manly carriage and impressive demeanor of the man, and still more with his profound and learned conversation. The beggar imparted to the friar the secret of a new world. Claimed as a guest, the stranger was heard to detail his plans to the charmed and intelligent community. Garcia of Palos, who

was then consulted, sustained the theories of the stranger, and old pilots recalled and related again the traditions of the sea, as often told and retold by many a veteran tar. The friar caught from the missionary zeal of Columbus the apostolic fire; as a Spaniard the future glory of his country dawned upon him, and as a Churchman rich harvests of souls were foretold for the Church. Young Diego was detained at the convent and Columbus was supplied with money for his journey and a letter of introduction to the prior of the monastery of El Prado, the Queen's confessor. Taking leave of his new, but trustful friends, he now wended his way to Cordova, where the royal court was then held. It was in January, 1486. Ferdinand and Isabella, both young, gifted, aspiring, zealous for the faith, ambitious of renown and capable of governing empires, then reigned over the united kingdoms of Aragon and Castile. Ferdinand had not lived and reigned long enough to be openly crafty, selfish and ungrateful. Isabella was incapable of ever being so. While Father Juan Perez was the providential friend, Isabella was the providential queen. The destiny of Columbus seemed near to fulfilment. It was fortunate that Isabella possessed those high qualities of mind and heart, which Tarducci describes as pre-eminently fitting her to reign and to lead among sovereigns. It was fortunate, as Mr. Irving writes, that she was one of the purest and most beautiful characters in history. It was fortunate, as Montalembert relates, that she was the noblest woman that ever reigned over men. It was providential, as the Count de Lorgues so eloquently pleads, that a tender piety, a profound sense of religion, an unswerving faith, a broad capacity, a love of souls, and a true Christian zeal, made her worthy to be the patroness of the apostolic mission of Columbus.

Isabella had inherited the gloriously commenced but yet unfinished work of expelling the infidel Moors from Christian Spain. The crusade was then at its height, and when Columbus arrived at Cordova, the king and queen, the nobility and generals of Spain, at the head of the Christian armies, were marshalling for a final blow at Mahometanism in the Peninsula. The clang of arms, the din of preparation, the ardor of war overcame the voice of petition for the discovery even of a new world. Columbus was a silent and submissive but intensely disappointed spectator of these bustling and warlike scenes. He earnestly and hopefully sought the presence of the prior of the monastery of Prado, Fernando de Talavera, but the cautious and busy ecclesiastic put him off; the king and queen were too much engrossed by the war, and neither the queen nor her confessor had time to listen to the new and startling scheme, if not mad dream, of a poor and threadbare foreigner. His arrival in Cordova was on January 20, 1486. Campaigns, sieges, battles

and marches caused the court to shift its location according to military emergency. Columbus again resorted, for his support, to map making at Cordova. Such was his poverty that, but for the food generously given him by Alonzo de Quintanilla, he would have perished of hunger. In the midst of his sufferings he bore himself with dignity and courage, and no doubt even when his talent for cosmographical maps became known he won but a scanty support. It is certain that during this period of disappointment and of waiting he numbered amongst his friends not only the generous Quintanilla, treasurer of Castile, but also Monsignor Antonio Geraldini, the Papal Nuncio, and his brother, Alessandro, preceptor to the royal Infanta. Through these sympathetic and intelligent friends he was introduced to the powerful Cardinal of Spain, Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza, Archbishop of Toledo, whose learning, penetration and judgment enabled him to appreciate the force of Columbus' arguments, and the value of his undertaking both to the Church and to Spain.

It was also during this period of waiting that he became acquainted with the noble and ancient family of Enriquez, one of the proudest, though not the richest, in Spain. This acquaintance led to his marriage into that distinguished family. Beatrix Enriquez became his second wife, and their union was blessed by the birth of Fernando Columbus. He afterwards became his father's historian, and under the will of Columbus, upon the failure of the lineage of Diego, the first son, was to succeed to the titles, honors, dignities and estates which the admiral was by the royal covenants to receive in recompense for his great discoveries. More than a century after the death of Columbus an inconsiderate critic hastily and rashly threw out a doubt as to the legality of this second marriage, which had never before been called in question, but had been uniformly affirmed by all contemporary and succeeding authorities, as well as by those more than a hundred years subsequent to the death of Columbus. This unjust aspersion against the good name and unblemished memory of one of the purest and most upright of men has inconsiderately been followed by many historians of repute, including our own gifted historian and scholar, Washington Irving. But it has been repeatedly refuted, and in recent years triumphantly disproved by the able and learned works of the Count Roselly de Lorgues, as well as by the more recent work of the Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, of England. A document of special value bearing on this subject, and one not found or published by Count de Lorgues, which has recently been found in the library of the Royal Historical Academy of Madrid by the Rev. Brother Marcellino da Civezza, historiographer of the Order of St. Francis, and another also recently

found at Valencia by the Rev. Raymond Buldee, are sufficient to refute this calumny. These valuable documents were not very far from being contemporary with Columbus. From the former of these documents, extracted from a work specially devoted to the history of the noble families of Cordova, we have taken a passage which we translate and publish now for the first time in English, as follows :

" Christopher Columbus, grand admiral of the West Indies, married twice—the first time in Portugal with Dona Philippina Muñiz de Perestrello, who gave him his oldest son, Diego ; the second time in Cordova, with a young lady of that city named Beatrix Enriquez de Arana, of high lineage, a descendant of the Viscaya ; and from her he had Don Fernando Columbus, a knight of great intelligence, bravery, virtue and a great scholar, after leaving the service of the Prince Don Juan, whose page he had been."

Through the offices and potent influence of Mendoza, the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, a man of learning, generosity, enlightened energy and breadth of views, Columbus received an audience with the Spanish sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella ; a boon which had been long delayed by the exigencies of the Moorish war. Though regarded by the vulgar and the ignorant as a conceited dreamer and fantastic projector, his impressive appearance, his dignified manners, his clear and ringing language, the sincerity of his character and his ready learning had already gained for him the respect and sympathy of the great, the good and the learned. Now he gained the ear of royalty. This audience occurred in 1486. On appearing before the august court of the Catholic sovereigns he was modest in deportment, profoundly respectful and yet open, candid and self-sustained. He felt this first time that he met them the same prophetic foresight as he did afterwards, in 1503, when he addressed them from the New World as the " ambassador of the Most High, chosen by His infinite Goodness to announce the enterprise of the Indies, to the most potent prince of Christendom laboring unceasingly for the propagation of the faith." In the royal presence he calmly, lucidly and triumphantly explained the scientific, traditional and practical grounds on which his theory rested, described the empires he should discover for Spain, and the millions of souls that would be gained for Christendom, and extolled it above the noble yet comparatively contracted and diminutive enterprise and benefits of the Moorish conquests. He asked for ships and outfit, and he would unflinchingly achieve a certain and glorious result. The Catholic sovereigns were deeply impressed by the bold yet dazzling proposals and profound arguments of Columbus. The noble and generous nature of Isabella seemed at once to comprehend and

appreciate the grandeur of the enterprise, its glory and benefits to Spain, its exalted good to the poor heathens, and its boundless advantages to religion. The more calculating Ferdinand, while deeply moved by Columbus' proposals, arguments and proofs, cautiously refrained from committing himself, and resolved to refer the whole matter to a learned body for investigation. Father Talavera was accordingly requested to assemble a learned board of theologians, cosmographers and astronomers to examine, discuss and report on the subject. Such was the origin, such was the object of the famous council of Salamanca. Columbus anticipated the happiest results from the convening of so learned and august a body. Talavera, owing to the backwardness of Spain in geographical and cosmographical guides and enterprises, found but few members for the council who were skilled in such matters, hence the majority of the council or junta were necessarily chosen from the clergy and one or two other professions. The great majority were ecclesiastics. The conference was held in the Dominican Monastery of St. Stephen's, where Columbus became the welcome and honored guest of the generous and enlightened friars. It was a remarkable spectacle, when a mere foreign mariner, untitled and undecked, relying solely on the justice of his cause, stood in the midst of this dignified and punctilious body. Without prestige, with none of the trappings of wealth and station, without indorsement or diploma from any learned university, he had no dependence but upon his own genius and courage, and these did not fail him. With the exception of the Dominican Fathers, who listened attentively to all he had to say, and received intelligent conviction therefrom, the members of the junta seemed from the beginning to be prejudiced against his cause and against his person, regarding him as an adventurer and a visionary. The majority paid but little attention to his discourse, ignorantly and arrogantly feeling content to accept the status of the earth as it had been traditionally and unscientifically handed down to them. The case seemed already prejudged. When some discussion naturally sprang up, the arguments adduced against Columbus seem puerile and ridiculous. The distinguished and learned members of the council denied the sphericity of the earth, and quoted the words of David to prove that the earth and the impending heavens must be flat; the scriptural expression, *extendens coelum sicut pellem*, was inconsiderately construed as representing the heavens as drawn tight and flat across and over the earth like the extended hide of an animal, as was the custom of the pastoral Israelites in the time of David and his predecessors, in forming their tents; or like a horizontal curtain or cover. Every passage from the Old Testament and from the Fathers of the Church bear-

ing however remotely on the subject, was hunted up and adduced in opposition to the theory of Columbus.

That passage of St. Augustine, in which the illustrious doctor regarded the idea of the antipodes as a ridiculous and amusing fable, was confidently quoted in refutation of his scientific arguments. Various and endless were the objections crudely stated and illogically argued. Columbus, however, was so thoroughly master of the whole subject, that he found no difficulty in refuting and exposing the sophistry of his opponents, whether drawn from Scripture or from the Fathers or from science. When he boldly met and explained the religious and theological points, upon principles and methods of correct interpretation, and as now accepted by Christian scholars, with unanswerable arguments, a murmur passed through the assembly that his views were heretical, and that he might be subjected to the scrutiny of the Inquisition. His friend, Alessandro Geraldini, a learned scholar and profound theologian, taking warning at once, hastened to the great cardinal of Spain, and by his influence, and still more by his arguments, warded off the danger. Columbus, in the Council of Salamanca, rose to the grandeur of his mission. Power of argument, unanswerable facts, invincible logic, and sublime eloquence, almost transfigured him. The conviction of the noble Diego Deza, afterwards archbishop of Toledo, of the Dominican Fathers, and of a few other learned theologians, gained a more calm audience for the pleader for a new world, and perhaps led to the adjournment of the assembly from time to time, rather than to the abrupt rejection of the proposal. Procrastination, indifference, neglect, and prejudice, made the work of the conference fruitless. Columbus followed up the subject with the Spanish Court. In the spring of 1487, he again sought to promote his cause, at Malaga, during its siege by the Catholic sovereigns; again at Cordova, then at Saragossa; and thus, as late as February, 1489, he again followed the court to Valladolid, then to Medina del Campo, and again to Cordova. Occasional payments were made by the Crown to Columbus during these anxious and wasting years, ostensibly for services; and at Cordova, lodgings were provided for him at the royal expense. The fortunes of the war varied; the campaign against the strong city of Beza, in which Columbus patriotically served as a soldier in the Spanish army, finally proved triumphant, and on December, 22, 1490, Muley Boabdil, the elder Moorish chief of that name, surrendered to the victorious sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella. The conquerors entered Seville in triumph in February, 1491; regal and national festivities and rejoicings engrossed every mind; a royal marriage ensued; *and Columbus waited*. He received occasional subsidies

from the Crown, which indicated that he had gained some little ground, or that his cause was not rejected at Court; but he still made maps and charts for a living. He even received the tantalizing encouragement of an order or summons to follow the Court,—that which he had, in fact, been doing for several years. Time passed on; and such was the pinching poverty of Columbus, that he was compelled to live on the alms he received from his generous friends, Deza, Quintanilla, and a few others. In the winter of 1491, he saw the whole of Spain exerting its utmost strength and power towards commencing the siege of Grenada. Surely, when this city should be conquered by Spanish valor, a New World might be worth discovering; the Mohammedans would have perished by the sword—surely, then, the countless heathens of another hemisphere might now be saved by the Cross! But the natural sentiment of self-preservation aroused the followers of the Prophet. The Mohammedans of Spain felt that the death-struggle was upon them, and they appealed for aid in their dire extremity to their co-religionists in Northern Africa; their prayer of anguish was heard; and it seemed that Spain might experience another, yet a forlorn and desperate, invasion of the Crescent and its fanatical followers. The Crescent and the Cross had yet to meet again in battle. The younger Boabdil, el Chico, was at the head of his legions, intrenched in the impregnable fortress of Grenada. It was not consistent now with the national honor of Spain to leave a vestige of Mohammedan possession or rule in the Peninsula. The Cross alone should glitter there. Both banners could not float in Spain.

Columbus, after years of solicitation and waiting, had abandoned perfidious Portugal, and brushed its dust from his feet; he now resolved to leave Spain, and try his fortunes and plead the cause of the New World in France, to whose sovereign he had but recently sent his proposals. He had previously sent his ever-faithful brother Bartholomew to England, to present the same to then Catholic Britain, and to her king, Henry VII. He abandoned a court from which he had received only hope deferred and agonizing delay. He accordingly made his way to the convent of La Rabida, intending to remove his son, Diego, thence, and place him, with the young Fernando, in charge of his second wife, Beatrice Enriquez, at Cordova, before proceeding to the Court of France. This was the second visit Columbus had paid to the Convent of La Rabida. Since his first visit in 1486, when he asked bread and water at the convent gate for himself and son, he had spent five years at court in fruitless and humiliating solicitations. At his second visit to the convent, in 1491, he was as poor as he had been at his first visit, and yet much more dejected and hopeless. The best

part of his life had been spent in solicitation ; and yet it seemed that he had accomplished nothing. Life and hope had waned together. At each visit to La Rabida, he was welcomed by prior and monks with equal hospitality.

Columbus had received already a letter from the king of Portugal, John II., dated March 20, 1488, inviting him back to Portugal, and giving him assurances of the royal protection ; but he had distrustingly rejected the invitation. He had also received letters from the kings of England and of France ; he had given Spain the preference over all. Even when Spain seemed to have rejected his proposals, he made application for aid in fitting out an expedition to two Spanish grandees ; first to the Duke of Medina-Sidonia, and secondly, to the Duke of Medina-Celi ; but here, too, though he had deeply impressed those noblemen with his great plans and proposals, and though, had they been sovereigns, they would have accepted his offers ; yet the scheme was too vast for the most powerful of subjects or richest of nobles ; he was doomed to meet with new disappointments. Penniless, he was unable to provide subsistence for himself, and still less for his wife and two sons ; no wonder that the learned and sympathetic historian, Tarducci, said, " the father's heart was ready to burst."

The noble soul of Columbus found sympathy again at La Rabida in the great heart of the prior, Juan Perez de Marchena. The monk's judgment was fortified by the opinions of experienced cosmographers and mariners of Palos ; another effort must be made in Spain. A letter was promptly dispatched by the prior to Queen Isabella by the hands of Sebastian Rodriguez, a faithful pilot of Lepi, while Columbus remained an honored guest at the convent. The messenger, within two weeks, delivered Father Marchena's letter to the Queen at the city of Santa Fé, and brought back the royal answer to La Rabida. The good prior immediately, at the request of the Queen, repaired to the court at Santa Fé, starting at midnight, and making the journey through the enemy's country, secretly, without even a lantern, and in danger of capture by the Moors at each step of his mule in the dark. When he appeared before Isabella, he seemed already like the apostle of a new Christendom, such was the eloquence of his noble countenance. With arguments and motives drawn from science, religion, and patriotism, the prior pleaded with the gentle queen. His appeals were generously and ardently supported by the noble and exalted inspiration of one of her own sex, her favorite maid of honor, the Marchioness of Moya, a woman true to every sentiment of religion and honorable ambition for her country. The point is gained ; Isabella sends for Columbus to come before her again, and dispatches the money necessary to enable him to make

a respectable appearance at court, and to procure a mule for his journey.

So prompt and earnest was Columbus to reach the presence of the queen, and plead again the cause of the New World, it is said, that he scarcely gave himself time to purchase the requisite clothing for appearing at court. Surely, now his cause was gained! Portugal, England, France, and even Spain, seemed to supplicate the suppliant of twenty years! Who could suppose that Columbus would meet with a moment's delay again, or that the Court would not be thrown open to the greatest of geographical projectors?

At the time of his arrival at the city of Santa Fé, the war against Granada was in its last crisis. This proud Moorish city, the last stronghold of the Infidels in Spain, had sustained a brave and obstinate siege, and had made a gallant defence, but was now brought to the verge of surrender; her walls were battered down, her defences destroyed, her weapons exhausted; she lay at the mercy of the Christian army, and her defenders were demoralized by civil discord, and fraternal blood shed within the ranks of her own garrison. The youngest and bravest of her royal line, Boabdil el Chico, was forced to open the gates of the proud city to the foes of nearly eight hundred years, and the Spanish sovereigns, in the near-by city of Santa Fé, were preparing to enter the fallen stronghold and supplant the last Crescent in Spain with the Cross. Such was the condition of affairs when Columbus entered the royal city, silently yet hopefully, mounted on his mule. But again he was put off; the sovereigns sent him word that at such a moment in their affairs they could not receive him or attend to his proposals. The Queen, however, considerably consigned him to the hospitality of his good friend Alonzo de Quintanilla, for she knew their mutual friendship, and the disappointed suppliant found consolation in the friendship of the Queen's Minister of Finance. On January 20, 1492, Boabdil, last of the Moorish kings, surrendered the keys of the city of Granada to Father Talavera, who was created Archbishop of Granada, and who drew down the banner of the Crescent and raised the Cross on the towers of the Alhambra. Ferdinand and Isabella solemnly and triumphantly entered the conquered city on the feast of the Epiphany, January 6th, and the rejoicings and celebrations that followed were in keeping with the grandeur of the occasion and the importance of the event. Under such circumstances, Columbus, though his mind dwelt sadly and solemnly on his one great thought, could but wait. This time he did not wait in vain.

It is but just, however, to the Spanish sovereigns to relate that the first business to which they gave their attention after the national festivities following the fall of Granada, was the affair

of Columbus. The royal mind was made up that his proposal should be accepted. Columbus had seemed already elevated above the ordinary standard of men ; he had conceived a truth unknown to the world ; he had prayed for an opportunity to put his life in peril to demonstrate it ; now it was that kings sought his alliance, that thereby they might reap the reward of his study, his genius and his heroism. Ferdinand and Isabella having determined to embark in the great enterprise of Columbus realized that it only now remained to arrange with him the terms of the venture, for so it appeared to them and to the world. Accordingly a commission was appointed of which Talavera was also the president, to stipulate with Columbus on the terms upon which he would undertake the momentous voyage of discovery. Columbus, on the other hand, did not regard the affair as a venture, but as a certainty ; he saw from the beginning the vastness, the grandeur, the priceless value of the prize awaiting his valor and his genius ; he had in his mind even at this early period of civilization not only the bestowal upon Spain of a new world and upon Christendom of a new apostolate and a new triumph, but he also regarded himself as the instrument especially selected by Providence for restoring to Christendom the Holy Land and sacred places consecrated by the life, the death and blood of the Saviour of mankind. This last great work had already developed in his mind and soul though he had not announced it to the world. In fact, as it was afterwards made manifest, he regarded the discovery of the New World as secondary to the far greater undertaking of rescuing the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels and restoring it to Christendom. In his great soul the treasures of the New Christendom were to be consecrated to a vindication of the honor and integrity of the old. He had resolved to devote a large share of his expected revenues to this sacred cause for which two centuries before Christian kings and people had sacrificed so much valuable treasure and so much gallant blood. He regarded himself as entitled to a reward commensurate with his certain success and with the immensity of the prize he was to bestow upon his country ; a reward adequate to the undertaking of the Columbian crusade. All this, when paid to him, would leave Spain and the world still his debtor. This proves there was nothing mercenary about Columbus.

When, therefore, the royal commissioners opened negotiations with him in regard to the terms of the undertaking, Columbus demanded the rank and title of Admiral of the Ocean, together with all the powers and privileges belonging to the admirals of Castile in their respective districts, the rank, title and jurisdictions of viceroy and governor of all the islands and continents he should

discover, with the same authority enjoyed by the admirals of Castile and Leon, including the power to make and revoke at his discretion all the executive and judiciary appointments; that all provincial and municipal governors should be selected by the sovereigns from the three persons he should nominate for each place, and that he himself should appoint the judges to decide upon all controverted questions of commerce and affairs arising between the Indies and any part of Spain. He also demanded, in addition to the compensation belonging to the aforesaid offices of admiral, viceroy and governor, one-tenth as his share of all things to be found, bought, won or exchanged within the boundaries of his admiralty, subject only to one-tenth of the cost of acquisition. As he had already devoted the best part of his life to the cause, and as the remainder of his life would not suffice for the full accomplishment of all things, and as the sovereigns and the world would transmit the fruits of his discoveries to posterity, so he also demanded that the same offices, titles and emoluments should become hereditary in his family in the order of primogeniture. Would not the design of redeeming the Holy Land fall to his descendants to finish, according to the intended provisions of his will? Then why should the means of fulfilling the great task be withdrawn at his death. Furthermore who would inherit his name and his apostolate? Should the family of the Ocean admiral and viceroy and governor of the Indies be left in poverty, while Spain and the world grew rich, and while the crusade was conducted at the expense of Columbus and his heirs?

The terms demanded by Columbus aroused the indignation, even the contempt, of the commission. One of them sneeringly said to him, that as the sovereigns were to pay the whole expense of the expedition, his demands manifested great regard for his own interests, since, whatever might be the result, he could enjoy the honor of a great command and incur no loss in case of failure. Columbus immediately repelled the malicious innuendo by offering to bear one-eighth of the expense on condition of his receiving one-eighth of the profits. Talavera, in behalf of the commission, reported against the proposals of Columbus, and gave his version of the grounds of their rejection. Isabella's mind was perplexed between the arguments of her former confessor, the Prior of La Rabida, and those of her present confessor, Archbishop Talavera. She proposed other terms to Columbus, which though honorable, still in his judgment were inadequate; these in turn were rejected by him. The negotiations were broken off, and Columbus, early in February, 1492, departed again from the court and from the royal city, and was on his way to Cordova to take leave of his wife and children, and then to proceed to France.

The friends of Columbus were greatly grieved at this abrupt and unfortunate termination of the negotiations. Many of them made powerful appeals to the queen, for all seemed to trust in her greatness of mind and soul for the ultimate success of the undertaking. Principal among these advocates of Columbus and his cause was Luis de Santangel, receiver of the ecclesiastical revenues of Aragon; his noble appeal to Isabella should be preserved in perpetual memory, and we give it to our readers; he said, "He was greatly astonished that her highness, who had always shown the greatness of her mind in every important affair, should now fail to undertake one where the risk was so small, and the service of God, the exaltation of the Church, and the gain of glory to the kingdom and people of Spain were so great. And here was Christopher Columbus going to offer his undertaking elsewhere, and other princes would enjoy the glory and advantages which the sovereigns of Spain rejected. What a sorrow would it not be to her, what a mortification, to have refused the demands of Christopher Columbus, when she should hear his name resounding through all Europe for his wonderful discovery! How justly would her people complain that she had deprived them of such glory and benefits, and left other nations to enjoy this good fortune! They laid the blame of the disagreement on the pride and immoderate greed of Columbus; but what had he asked for that should excite such wonder and complaint of the boldness and impudence of his demands? He asked to be paid for his labor, if he succeeded in fulfilling what he had promised; and he promised to bestow on Spain islands, kingdoms, seas, treasures, and nations without number; if his undertaking came to nothing, he asked nothing; and he not only risked his life in the dangers of the voyage, but he also offered to share the expense of carrying it out. And this was called unbounded pretension! This was impudence! This was regarding only his own pride and ambition! Some of these learned men said that the enterprise was impossible, but the convincing arguments brought forward by Columbus proved quite the reverse; and this was proved, too, by his readiness to undertake the voyage, and his liberality in bearing part of the cost; and a man of so much study and experience of the sea was not influenced by appearances and the seductions of imaginary suppositions, but had his thoughts firmly grounded in scientific reasons. Even admitting that the voyage resulted in nothing, that could be no shame to the crown, as some pretended; but rather the direct contrary; for, if other princes had been highly lauded for merely attempting a step or two in the road of discovery, what glory would not their highnesses gain if they boldly pursued the discovery of one of the greatest secrets of the universe? Nor should it be said that it was

too uncertain, for in matters of great importance, even a doubt ought to be cleared up; and to ascertain the truth of such doubt, any sum was well spent. And the sum asked by Columbus to procure and fit out a few ships was so trifling, that any wealthy individual could bear it without inconvenience. Let her highness, then, silence every other consideration, and listen only to her magnanimity, and not suffer posterity to think that the glorious Isabella, on the point of undertaking the greatest work ever imagined on earth, was withheld by the fear of risking the loss of a small sum of money."

The noble and generous Isabella was a willing convert to the exalted views of the treasurer of Aragon. His victory was complete; for she now pledged her word that she would undertake and carry out the expedition, and that she would accept the terms so strenuously insisted on by Columbus. But even now there was another obstacle, another cause of delay. So great was the financial exhaustion caused by the recent wars that she felt compelled to defer the expedition until the means were provided, when she would at once proceed. Ferdinand was not pleased with the queen's compliance, and, again alleging an exhausted exchequer, he struggled to win her away from the undertaking. It was at this moment that Isabella proved herself a true Castilian. She replied to the king:

"Very well; I will assume the whole burden of the cost, as Queen of Castile; and if it is believed that further delay may jeopardize the undertaking, I will pledge my jewels to raise the necessary funds."

Santangel promptly replied: "It is not necessary for your Highness to pledge your diamonds; I will take it on myself to find the sum necessary for proceeding at once with the undertaking."

Isabella and Santangel were the heroes of the occasion. The offer of Santangel was accepted by the queen. A captain of the guards was dispatched for Columbus to summon him to court. The officer overtook the greatest hero of the occasion, as, in solemn silence and sadness, he traversed the road near the bridge of Peños. The summons moved not at first the man of so many disappointments; words of renewed assurance were uttered by the captain in the queen's name; a moment of hesitation followed; Columbus saw in faith and science the New World; he turned his mule's head back to Santa Fè, and uttered a prayer of thanksgiving, *Deo Gracias*. At court once more the offer is renewed, the acceptance is given. The queen yielded all, while Ferdinand, urged by the queen and his courtiers, yielded a formal consent, which was limited to signing the compact as was required

by the terms of union between Castile and Aragon. Beyond that he declined co-operation. When funds were to be drawn from the coffers of Aragon, there existed a regular contract for their reimbursement.

The undertaking was Isabella's; so much so that during the separate administrations of Castile and Aragon none but Castilians were allowed to reside and trade in the New World. Accordingly Ferdinand, when he received the first gold paid to him from the New World for reimbursement of his outlay, applied it to the gilding of the ceilings and vaults of his own royal palace at Saragossa. Christopher Columbus, on the other hand, thus verifying his prophetic name of the Christ-bearer, consecrated the first gold he received from the New World to the making of a chalice of the purest virgin gold for holding the Holy Eucharist, the Christ in the Sacrament of Love and Thanksgiving.

The true position of Columbus was now royally acknowledged by Ferdinand and Isabella; he was publicly treated with the deference and respect due to his exalted office; the noble title of Don was affixed to his name, and was conferred upon him and his descendants and heirs. On April 17, 1492, the Articles of Agreement between the sovereigns and Columbus, which had now been drawn up, with every point of ceremony observed, were signed in solemn form by Ferdinand and Isabella, and by Columbus. His full demands were conceded, and the additional clause was added by which Columbus reserved the right to contribute one-eighth towards the expenses of this or of any other expedition he might undertake for their majesties, in consideration whereof he was to receive one-eighth of the profits. On April 30th, letters patent, in solemn form, were issued and published, conferring upon Columbus, and confirming, all his titles and privileges as stipulated by the treaty, and declaring the offices of Governor and Viceroy to be hereditary in his family. Columbus was now virtually admitted among the Spanish nobility, and from this time he had to maintain a certain dignity consistent with his rank in that punctilious age and country.

Tradition and romance added an interesting feature to this solemn compact and formal arrangement for exploring the earth and bringing together the most distant potentates, empires and people. Belief in the existence of monarchs of potent and fabulous grandeur and riches was then quite general; and that the prospective voyage of Columbus would carry him to the extremities of Asia and to the fabled regions of spices and gold, no one doubted. Odd as it seems to us in our age to behold the foremost and most accomplished monarchs of Europe addressing a letter to the Grand Khan, to Prester John and other Oriental potentates, the

fact itself is so interesting that we will transcribe it here for the amusement of the reader.

“Ferdinand and Isabella, to the King——

“The Spanish Sovereigns have heard that You and Your Subjects have a great affection for them and for Spain. They are further aware that you and your subjects are very desirous of information concerning Spain ; they accordingly send their Admiral, Christopher Columbus, who will tell you that they are in good health and perfect prosperity.”

“Granada, April 30, 1520.”

Not only was Columbus now received and treated by the Spanish sovereigns with the dignity and consideration extended only to noblemen, but the queen, with true royal tenderness and delicacy, conferred upon him an unexpected favor in appointing his elder son, Diego, a page of honor to the royal prince, the Infante Don Juan, heir-apparent to the Spanish throne, with a liberal annuity. The Spanish form of his name, Colon, now became of general use in Spain, and was inserted in all the official documents. Preparations were immediately commenced for the expedition, which was destined to prove so honorable to Spain, so momentous to the world, so manfully demanded and so successfully executed by Columbus. The little maritime town of Palos had already become signally associated with the history of the Admiral ; it was now chosen as the port that was to supply him with the ships for the discovery of the New World, and from which that little fleet was to sail. Palos was already under a penalty, for some disturbance within its limits, to supply and keep in readiness for sea in the royal service two caravels, but as Columbus had declared that three vessels at least were necessary for the expedition, he was empowered to procure another. The authorities of Andalusia were directed by royal decree to provide all necessary supplies for the ships and severe penalties were denounced against any persons refusing to do so. The supplies were declared free from royal duties, the wages of the crews were made the same as on board the Spanish men-of-war, and they were commanded to obey Columbus in all things and to sail wherever he commanded. The Admiral, however, was instructed not to sail to the Portuguese Mine of St. George, in Guinea, or to any recently discovered possession of Portugal on the Coast of Africa or in the Atlantic Ocean. Certain privileges were accorded to the sailors faithfully doing their duty in the expedition.

Having concluded all his arrangements with the court, and having seen his son handsomely provided for by his appointment as a royal page, Columbus took leave of his most gracious sovereigns, of Don Diego and his friends, and repaired to Palos to pre-

pare for the departure. Again he became the honored guest of the good monks of La Rabida, who rejoiced in the final triumph of their friend. The friendship of the reverend prior of the convent gave Columbus strength and support in hastening his preparations at Palos. On May 25th Father Juan Perez and the Admiral proceeded the church of St. John, and caused the royal orders for two caravels to be solemnly read by a notary in the presence of the alcalde, the magistrates and nearly the whole population of the town. The officials of Palos promised a ready compliance with the royal commands, and the bustle of excitement resounded at Palos and the neighboring town of Moguer. All things assumed a gay and joyous aspect. The Admiral and the prior were the interesting and potent characters in this strange and unique proceeding.

As soon as the excitement of the moment was passed, and the people began to understand the destined course of the expedition, fear paralyzed every heart in Palos. Popular notions of the Atlantic ocean at that day can scarcely now be imagined or believed. However philosophers from most ancient times may have viewed the Atlantic ocean and the earth from a scientific point of view, the masses of the people regarded it with unconquerable fear and abhorrence. It was to them a *Sea of Darkness*; and learned cosmographers united with the ignorant masses in equipping it with frightful dangers and the most monstrous beings. Its waters were black and fetid, alive with ferocious monsters of gigantic size, and possessing strength to drag the largest vessels into the deepest and deadliest gulfs of ocean. So terrible were the demons of the air, that one of them in particular, a fabled bird called the Roc, was so huge and powerful as to be able to attack the largest ships, lift them up in its beak into the clouds and there crush them in its terrible talons, so that mangled human bodies, still palpitating with life, and broken tables, victuals, furniture and armor, fell to the waters below, only to be ferociously gobbled up by the huge mouths of the monsters of the Dark Sea. The announcement of such an expedition only served to revive with increased vividness the traditions of centuries and the superstitions of ancient time. Every map of ocean, even by learned cosmographers, peopled its waters with fearful monsters, demons and giants. Such as escaped the yawning abyss became the prey of hideous animals. Panic pervaded the whole community. The venerable and popular prior, Juan Perez, of La Rabida, endeavored in vain, by daily public exhortations, to allay the fears of the people. Columbus, in a community of veteran mariners and experienced navigators, was the only man willing to sail westward across the the Atlantic. Neither his example nor his reasonings could calm the universal excitement.

Nor could the authority of an officer sent from the royal household, Juan de Peñasola, nor the penalties and fines he imposed by royal authority, accomplish more than the forcible seizure of a small caravel, the *Pinta*, which belonged to Gomez Rascon and Cristobal Qintero of Palos. Even now, when the *Pinta* came to be repaired and made seaworthy, such was the disaffection of its owners and of the mechanics and people of Palos towards so rash and impracticable a voyage, and that too by a foreigner and adventurer and an alleged deceiver of the royal credulity, that no progress could be made in the preparations. The ship carpenters and caulkers fell ill or concealed themselves; neither wood, tar, oakum, cables or other materials or equipments could be obtained even in a maritime city. Columbus felt that if such were the difficulties experienced in the struggle for one little caravel, how could he hope ever to obtain the three vessels that were needed for the discovery of the New World? Under such circumstances it becomes particularly interesting, especially now in an age not favorable to the monastic orders, to relate how a monk of the fifteenth century threw himself into the breach and labored for the success of the most momentous and fruitful maritime expedition ever undertaken in any century of the world's history. This I will relate in the earnest words of the Count Roselly de Lorgues: "In this critical situation, the zeal of Father Juan Perez came to the aid of his friend and of the misguided people. The Franciscan from the poorness of his living, and the coarseness of his garb, is naturally sympathetic with the people. He is loved, because he evidently loves. His modest familiarity attracts while his devotedness attaches him. The superior of La Rabida, moreover, enjoyed a personal consideration among seamen. He mixed with the sailors, jesting at their terrors, and tranquilizing the minds of their families, and went, making the enrollment, by his words and by his influence, even to the neighboring ports. The zealous Franciscan expected from this expedition the extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, a great glory for the Church, and great advantage to civilization. He felt, as had been so justly said by the queen, that Columbus went into the oceanic regions to accomplish great things for the service of God. As a Catholic he took an active part in the good work and prided himself in co-operating in the apostolate of his guest; thus endeavoring to realize the wish of the founder of the Seraphic Order, whose zeal sought to preach Jesus Christ, His cross, and His holy poverty, throughout the whole universe. Thus Father Juan labored, with heart and soul, to change the poltroons into men of courage, and to decide the irresolute."

It was now that the Pinzons providentially appeared on the busy scene, and secured the success of the embarkation. Here

too the Franciscan monk was the potent agent of the crisis. He had before, when Columbus took refuge at the convent from the disappointments experienced at court, sent for Martin Alonso Pinzon together with Dr. Garcia Fernandez of Palos, for Pinzon was a sea-captain of great experience and fame, as well as a man of liberal fortune, and he belonged to a successful and wealthy family. Impressed at that time with the policy of Columbus, Pinzon, now at the very moment of direst dejection, came forward and offered to join Columbus in the expedition. It is with good reason that that learned publicist and historian, Francesco Tarducci, recognized in this sudden and almost unaccountable event, one of those providential occurrences so often repeated in the after-life of the Admiral, when Providence evidently stood between him and ruin, and even between him and death. The three Pinzon brothers, Martin Alonso, Francisco Martin and Vicente Yañez, not only gave their money and services to Columbus for the expedition, but the youngest of the three Pinzons, Vicente Yañez, gave his staunch and beautiful little caravel, the *Niña*, to the dread adventure. Great excitement prevailed at Palos when it became the gossip of the old town that the Pinzons, such men of wealth, of maritime experience, of renowned skill in navigation, of such recognized prudence and good judgment, had joined the cause of Columbus.

It was no new sailor's-yarn, when it was bruited about the docks and shipping, in the homes, and around the churches of Palos, that even "Old Martin" was, himself, going to make the venture with this arch adventurer, and to sail down into the Sea of Darkness in the little *Niña*. The relations and friends of the Pinzons now flocked to join the expedition. The town of Palos supplied the third vessel, an old and sea-worn carrack, which was scarcely seaworthy, large though solid, the caravel *Gallego*; and now the work of equipment went on right generously. The Pinzons actively superintended the preparation of the three ships, and they evinced their confidence in the Admiral and his expedition by the important steps they took in providing him with the means, by advancing one-eighth of the cost of the expedition, thus making him a partner with the sovereigns in the profits of the venture. In the meantime, Columbus spent his time chiefly in prayer, meditation, and devout observances, at the convent of *La Rabida*, the guest of the good prior. It was now that he allied himself with the Seraphic Order, by becoming a member of the grand Order of St. Francis. He paid opportune and not infrequent visits to the port of Palos, to inspect the progress of the work of preparation, and to stimulate and encourage the Pinzons, the crews, and the workmen. It was on one of these visits that the Admiral, coming suddenly upon the scene where the *Pinta* was undergoing

repairs, after her seizure by Peñasola under royal authority, found the caulkers and the workmen at the moment stealthily engaged in so fixing the rudder of the ship as to appear perfectly secure to the casual observer, but the skilled and experienced eye of the Admiral detected the fraud by which they had so contrived as to secure its being unshipped at the least jerk; they thus endeavored to secure the return of the ship and their own friends in the crew by the necessity of sending the ship back before she had sailed many miles. When Columbus ordered the workmen to do their work over again, they absconded, and he was again compelled to resort to compulsion, under royal orders, to secure crews. The energy of Columbus, and his consummate ability finally brought all things in readiness, and by the beginning of August, 1492, the three vessels were ready to sail. The three ships with which Columbus sailed to the discovery of a New World, and to the solution of the great scientific problems of the Earth, though accepted by Columbus as sufficient, and the best possible, were disgracefully unfit for the service. With masterly genius, and unerring sagacity, Columbus realized the situation; miserable as was the equipment, it was the best possible; it had even cost a sacrifice on all sides to accomplish it, such as it was. Not a seaman, not a captain, in this nineteenth century, would, with such vessels, venture on an ordinary voyage over an ocean now familiar to us all. Such was the inadequate fleet that was, four hundred years ago, to brave for the first time the dread ocean—Sea of Darkness and of Death. It accomplished its appalling task! Columbus fulfilled his mission!

The Admiral's flag was hoisted on the Gallego, whose name was now changed by him to the *Santa Maria*, and the ship was placed under the special intercession of the Virgin Mother. The flag was the banner of a Crucified Saviour. On the flag-ship were embarked the Admiral's staff, and other principal officers, such as Diego de Arana, high-constable, and a near relative of Beatrix Enriquez, the Admiral's second wife; Pedro Gutierrez, chief accountant; Roderigo Sanchez of Segovia, comptroller; Roderigo de Escovedo, royal notary; Bernadino de Tapia, historiographer of the expedition; the converted Jew, Louis de Torres, an accomplished linguist, who, it was thought, might converse with the natives in some of the oriental languages of Asia, which was the continent they sought. The Admiral, in accordance with then-existing Spanish custom with men of rank, carried a number of ship's mates or pilots, and also esquires, on his personal staff; among his followers were such men as Pedro Alonzo Niño, Bartolomé Roldan, Sancho Ruiz, Diego Mendez, Francesco Ximenes Roldan, and Diego de Salcedo—some of whom afterwards won an unenviable notoriety.

Such was the local feeling in Palos against Columbus and his enterprise, that his own flag-ship had received not an officer nor a man nor a sailor from that place. It is true, Palos gave the Pinzons to the expedition, without whose co-operation it would seem that Columbus could not have succeeded in raising a fleet for the voyage; at least at Palos. It was the Pinzons who prevented Columbus from sailing from another port, and secured to that town the honor and the fame of having sent forth from her port the Admiral and the fleet that discovered America. But, while out of the sixty-six men on board the flag-ship, there were fifty-nine from about Seville, two Genoese, one Englishman, one Irishman, two Portuguese, and one Majorcan; there was not on his ship a man of Palos. Even the name of Pinzon, before so honored, did not come out untarnished. Palos only enjoys the historic renown—for Palos was the port of embarkation.

The other two caravels, the *Pinta* and the *Niña*, on the contrary, were officered and manned by the people of Palos and the neighboring town of Moguer, for, on these ships were the three Pinzons, their relatives, friends, and acquaintances. The *Pinta* was commanded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, and her officers and sailors numbered thirty. The *Niña* was under command of Vicente Yanez Pinzon, and the entire crew numbered twenty-four. The three ships forming the expedition carried in all one hundred and twenty officers and men. On board the *Pinta*, were Gomez Rascon and Christobal Quintero, the owners of the ship, who had been impressed against their wills to go as a part of her crew. Columbus had placed his elder son, Don Diego, with his two friends, Juan Rodriguez Cabezudo and Father Martin Sanchez, of Moguer, for the necessary instruction and preparation for assuming the duties that would be required of him at court as a page to the Spanish Infante, the heir apparent of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Before embarking on his flag-ship, and turning her prow westward, the Admiral went to confession, and afterwards he solemnly and devoutly received Holy Communion from the hands of his ever-faithful friend, the Prior of Rabida. All the officers and men of the expedition reverently followed his pious and manly example; for, indeed, it was religion alone that then gave courage, hope, fortitude, and strength to men about to embark on a voyage to another world—perhaps, a voyage to the realms of eternal fate. The fleet had now only awaited a favorable wind. The elements of nature, creatures of Providence, now favored the brave Admiral and his heroic followers. God speed them and their ships, the *Santa Maria*, the *Pinta*, and the *Niña*, on the morrow, when westward they will sail! God speed the Discoverers of America.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

TWENTY-FIVE years ago, in 1867, the eyes of the whole world were turned toward France. In her beautiful capital she had opened the second of her great exhibitions, the most brilliant that had yet been seen, and from far and near, hundreds of thousands came to admire and to learn, whilst the newspapers spread in every direction their vivid descriptions of all the wonderful products of nature and of human art that had been brought to compete for supremacy from every quarter of the globe. The solemn award of prizes was the crowning of the great event. Under the richly decorated roof of the *Palais de l'Industrie*, were gathered over thirty thousand spectators, comprising the very elite of the civilized world. Right and left of the Emperor were seated most of the actual or expectant sovereigns of Europe, and when, at the close of the formal ceremony, the Empress arose and moved along, with that combination of grace and majesty which recalled at each step the poet's description, *incessu patuit dea*, and responded with winning smile to the vociferous greetings awakened on all sides, it looked as if in her person France was proclaimed on that day queen of modern civilization.

As a fact France was then the leading power of Europe. From its inception, the imperial régime had been one of almost unbroken prosperity. The Crimean War and the short campaign which freed Italy, had given fresh lustre to the imperial eagles, whilst the arts of peace advanced with a rapidity hitherto unknown. Business flourished in every shape. Manufacturing grew in spite of foreign competition. Commercial treaties opened up an ever-widening market abroad to the staple products of the country—to her wines, her silks, her exquisite fruits and perfumes—above all to those articles in which the artistic sense and refined taste of the nation shone forth most conspicuously. As a consequence, riches flowed in from all quarters, and in such abundance, that at that time, an able English financier tells us, there was more accumulated wealth in France than in any country in the world.

A few years later all was changed. An unparalleled series of disasters had dragged down Napoleon from his throne and France from the exalted position she had so brilliantly filled. A dark cloud settled upon her; for a time, she was little thought of outside her own narrowed boundaries; popularity, ever on the track of success, had followed the German flag from Paris to Berlin.

By Catholics, however, the old "Christian Kingdom" in whose

great achievements they had often taken pride, could not be entirely forgotten. American Catholics, especially, could not be unmindful of their deep indebtedness, political and religious—to the French people. And to their credit be it said, that debt of gratitude they have on all occasions gladly acknowledged and generously paid. They witnessed with joy the prompt recovery, as a nation, of their old and faithful ally, but, since then, they have been watching with deep concern the growing estrangement, during these latter years, between Church and State, in a country where both were the object of their best wishes.

Indeed the whole condition of things in France is perplexing and puzzling to them, and to most people in America, when they attempt to form to themselves anything like an accurate and consistent conception of it. Thus, they cannot understand what objection the French Clergy can have to a republican form of government, or how the Catholic Church can be persecuted in a Catholic country, or what grievances may not be removed by constitutional agitation and the popular vote; and if they still remain, and if the State continues to be arbitrary and oppressive, why the Church does not at once sever the link that binds them together and assert her inalienable independence. Many are inclined to think that the grievances complained of are much exaggerated, not to say wholly imaginary. Others believe them to be real, but lay the principal blame on the Catholics themselves, more still, on their priests and bishops, who are supposed to be behind the times and out of sympathy with the spirit and aspirations of the people.

Such perplexities and conflicting views are perfectly natural. Few people are in a position to appreciate correctly the condition, if at all complicated, of any country but their own. To have visited others and to have conversed with some of the inhabitants, will not make them much wiser. Problems depending on numberless facts and agencies can be taken in fully only by living among them. Still, as regards France, a fairly correct impression of the condition of things may be gathered from a simple statement of the principal features of the case, and to this we propose to devote the present paper.

I.

Let us at once dispose of the notion that the French clergy have any decided or wide-spread objection to the Republican form of government, as such. We say without hesitation that, as a body, they have none. A Paris newspaper recently put the question to priests judiciously selected all over the country, and the answer came back, substantially confirming our statement. In those parts of France where the old traditions of the monarchy still survive it

is only natural that the clergy should share in them. Nor should we be surprised to find even outside such influences, many priests who, in common with some of the most thoughtful and ablest men in France, have been led to the conclusion that the republican form of government is ill suited to the temperament of the French people. History certainly goes far to sustain them in their belief. France had lived and flourished for centuries as a monarchy. Her whole political and social life had been cast in that mould. Her brightest memories belonged to it. She had never been so great as under the impulse and guidance of a single mind and a single will. With others it might be otherwise. Ancient Greece and Rome had been at their best as republics. In modern nations, such as America, suddenly sprung to life, with no roots in the past, no historical traditions, the republican form of government was doubtless the most suitable, not to say the only suitable one. But it was entirely out of harmony, they maintained, with the genius of France; nor was this a mere conjecture. Twice already within the last hundred years republican institutions had been tried in their midst and had singularly failed. In the first instance they had steeped the country in blood; in the second, they had led it to the very verge of socialism. And now a third trial was being given which promised little better, each succeeding year leading to a more open and more determined hostility to all religious belief and religious influence. Surely all this was more than sufficient to inspire in many members of the clergy an attitude of reserve, not to say of positive distrust, towards the new Republic. This was the predominant feeling, at the outset, of the wisest and best men in the country. Only those of exactly the opposite kind exhibited any enthusiasm. All the worst elements of society hailed the advent of "*la Republique*." "I should like to be a republican myself," a friend of ours once remarked. "But I am deterred by the sort of company in which I should find myself." Originally the Republic had been proclaimed in Paris after the crushing defeat of Sedan, in 1870, only by an excited crowd, and acquiesced in by the country only as a necessity. During the war and the few years of exhaustion that followed, it remained as a temporary arrangement. Even when the obstinacy of the Comte de Chambord led to making it definitive in 1875, many of those who voted for the republican constitution, saw nothing final in it, and its very framers only asked that it might get a fair trial.

The trial it has had for the last seventeen years—as fair as its best friends could have wished for. Death came most timely to the assistance of the new Republic, by removing its two greatest perils, Comte de Chambord on one side and the Prince Imperial on the other. The Orleans family, however estimable, had no

hold on the country, and could win favor only by the promise of a policy of wisdom and moderation, which it was open to the Republic at any time to adopt and to follow. In what manner it availed itself of the opportunity, we shall soon see. But from now we may observe that, from the very nature of the case, it depended entirely on the French republic itself to win or to estrange the good will of the French clergy.

That clergy had been in complete sympathy with the popular cause in the earlier and only reasonable phase of the great French Revolution. In that of 1848, it cordially welcomed the second Republic. In 1871 it quietly awaited developments, ever ready to abide by the decision of the wisest, and only solicitous to secure fair play and free action for itself. In the beginning of the second empire, from '52 to '57, it had found both, and it only took those five years to win over the great majority of French priests to the imperial dynasty. Still less time would have sufficed to make them staunch supporters of the Republic.

II.

But it seemed as if the latter had resolved from the beginning to discountenance any such disposition on their part. Even before they reached power, the advanced or "republican" party, as they called themselves, had already raised the war cry "Down with clericalism"; and it soon became visible that by clericalism was meant not merely priestly, but all religious influence. Since then, without intermission, steadily, methodically, the government of France has labored, wherever it dared and whenever it could, to uproot and destroy the faith and religion of the French people. Only those who have followed with attention and in detail the course of events for the last fifteen years can realize the full truth of such an indictment. It is, of course, officially denied, and has been so repeatedly. But a thin veil of hypocritical protest cannot hide patent facts, and the facts reveal an unmistakable effort to banish all trace of religion from the institutions of the country, and ultimately from the convictions and hearts of the people. It is doubtful whether the worst enemies of the Faith could have done more. An open, violent persecution would have opened the eyes of the people and led to a reaction. The policy accordingly was to proceed cautiously, to attempt only what would be tolerated or condoned, or what might be denied or plausibly accounted for. Measures of doubtful success were introduced by irresponsible members of the legislature. The mind of the country was felt by the government newspapers, and gradually prepared, when possible, for measures which, if openly endorsed by the government at the outset, would have led to defeat. Gambetta, the prophet of

the new Republic, had left behind him a recommendation to proceed warily and steadily. "To disable a powerful machine," he said, "it is not necessary to break it to pieces. A little sand continuously dropped into its cogs and wheels will soon bring it to a standstill." If we would know how the methods of that intense hater of priests and religion have been carried out, we have only to turn to the protest put forth on the 16th January of the present year by the Cardinals of France and adhered to by the whole French Episcopate.

That weighty document has been widely circulated in this country and doubtless has come under the notice of most of our readers. It is no mere transient expression of disappointment or displeasure, no exaggerated statement of insignificant grievances. It is the deliberate result of a lengthened and painful experience, of hoping far beyond all reasonable hope, and trusting the bland assurances of government until it would have been more than childish to trust them any longer.

To substantiate the episcopal verdict, it would be necessary to describe in detail all the vexatious measures enacted or sanctioned by the republican government for the last ten or fifteen years. The bishops refer to them in general terms, as to things only too well known to the Clergy and to the faithful. We must confine ourselves here to calling attention to their more salient features.

III.

1. The first grievance set forth in the protest is the manifest purpose of the Government to remove all trace of religion from its official action in the numberless details of its administrative functions, and banish it from the public life of what had been for ages and still substantially remains a great Catholic nation.

The religion of old countries means much more than the personal faith and practice of any single generation. It is a spirit which has come down from the distant past, and on its way has leavened the whole social mass, informing the manners and habits of the people, fashioning their thoughts and their language, and setting upon almost every feature of their outer life its visible and unmistakable impress. No Catholic brought up amidst Protestant or secular surroundings can forget the impression he experienced on visiting for the first time a country where the true faith had never ceased to prevail; with what deep enjoyment he lighted at each step, on some new and beautiful reminder of Catholic truth; the gorgeous church and the humble shrine, the statues of the Madonna and of the Saints in the public streets and squares, the wayside cross, the picturesque procession; the schools, the hospitals, the charitable institutions of all kinds, bearing visible signs,

within and without, of the Faith which had originated and still sustained them. All this was to him as a new revelation of divine truth; it was like passing from the chilling atmosphere of winter into the balmy softness and fragrance of spring. As to those who live habitually amidst such surroundings, there is not only a joy and a rest for the soul in them, but an abiding power to sustain and strengthen it in times of trial and darkness. There is help for the weak, comfort for the sorrowing, spiritual exaltation for all.

But it is all this that the government would fain destroy, the better to secularize society from top to bottom. Every religious influence dependent on its authority has been set aside or reduced to a minimum. The hospitals and prisons have been practically deprived of their attendant priests, the army of its chaplains. Catholic soldiers, regularly marched on Sundays to their respective churches in Protestant countries, such as England and Germany, cannot even show themselves in a body in any church in France, and what is sadder still, in most places no minor official can perform his duties as a Christian—not even attend at Mass on Sundays and holy days without exposing himself to almost certain destitution or removal.

2. Our readers remember how, failing to obtain from the legislature a special act expelling the religious orders, the government, on the strength of some obsolete enactment which they would never allow to be tested in a court of law, proceeded to drag from their homes hundreds of men who had devoted their lives to the noblest and most unselfish purposes. Scenes were enacted more like what happens in a barbarous, than what could be expected in a civilized country. Doors were forced; churches and chapels closed, valuable property made almost worthless, men, blameless in the eyes of the law, denied the right of dwelling under their own roofs and peaceably pursuing the useful calling of teacher or preacher, the only ones for which the training of their life had especially fitted them.

3. Some few religious societies of men, and many more of women, enjoying a corporative legal status could not be dealt with in this ruthless fashion. But they should be made in some other shape to share the common fate. They taught most of the public schools of France, and, as a rule, with unquestioned success. But they represented and doubtless exercised a religious influence, and so all the government schools of the country have been closed to them. In vain the localities where they taught sent up unanimous petitions to have them reinstated; in vain the "écoles laïques" substituted in their place remained empty; in vain, the municipal officers begged to be relieved of the burden put upon their townships to meet only imaginary requirements. It was all to no pur-

pose. The edict had gone forth and should at any cost be carried out; and so, in a country where the bulk of the people had grown up for centuries under religious teachers, such teachers were no longer considered worthy to be entrusted with the training of the future citizens of the new Republic.

4. The hospital nuns fared somewhat better. Enough of the old chivalrous spirit of France remained to protect them from ill treatment and sustain their well earned popularity. Yet in Paris and in several of the larger cities they were driven away from their blessed work by men of the worst type, intense haters of religion, who had succeeded in getting the management of city affairs into their hands. In Paris, all the leading hospital doctors protested repeatedly against the cruelty of depriving their poor patients of the care of kind and experienced nurses, to hand them over to others untrained, unreliable and often of questionable moral character. It was of no avail. Nothing could be laid to the charge of the nuns, no neglect, no undue religious pressure of any kind. They were loved by all the patients. But they were nuns; they wore the garb of religion, and they must go.

5. Still the teaching and hospital sisters continued to subsist. Nuns can live on little, and they die hard. Charitable hands and hearts were opened to them. Other works of Christian pity and love came to life and claimed their devotion. Property still remained in their hands, the patrimony of their present or departed members, or the fruit of their industry and thrifty living, or the gifts of benefactors anxious to have thereby a share in their good works. They could not be despoiled of it by confiscation, as in Italy. But special taxes, artfully contrived and ably worked could lead to the same result, and this is the method that has been adopted. Already the property of religious communities was taxed to its full value and paid as much to the treasury as any other property. But to this was added by a recent law: 1. An income tax based on purely imaginary revenues. 2. An "increase duty," as they call it, which, as has been abundantly demonstrated, would, if strictly applied, eat up in a few years the whole property of religious communities. The Christian Brothers alone would have to pay \$200,000 a year. As a fact, the Little Sisters of the Poor had to pay \$10,000 the first year, or have the homes of their aged poor sold out over their heads. A noble-hearted woman, the wife of President Carnot, paid the amount and solved the difficulty, but only for a twelvemonth.

6. It is by methods of somewhat a similar kind that the French government has undertaken to reduce the secular clergy to a proper degree of subserviency. The priests of France had learned to rely on the miserable allowance guaranteed to them by the

Concordate, and, it must be said, regularly paid them under every form of government since the beginning of the century. They are now no longer sure of getting it. Almost every day we hear of priests forfeiting the slender salary which is their only support, because they are supposed to have spoken some words or done some action considered hostile to the government. There is no trial, no opportunity of denying or explaining. The authorities have satisfied themselves that the men are guilty, and that is the end of it. It is only a short time since the Bishop of Carcassonne was deprived of part of his salary because he had actually gone to Rome without leave of absence! As a fact, no French Bishop thinks of asking it. But the rule is laid down in an obsolete article of the Organic Law, added arbitrarily to the Concordate by Napoleon I., and as the Bishop of Carcassonne was not considered to be friendly, this was adopted as a convenient way of punishing him. It did not hurt him much. To the Minister's letter he simply replied: "I have been to see the Pope, and I mean to do so as often as I deem it useful. You may take my money; I can forfeit it much easier than I could my self-respect and freedom of action."

In various clerical departments the supplies have been completely cut off. The canons of the Cathedral Chapters have no longer the modest stipend which allowed bishops to crown the last years of their most venerable priests with the *otium cum dignitate* they had so well earned. The seminaries no longer receive their wonted subsidies. Whilst nothing is spared on secular education, clerical education from beginning to end is left to shift for itself. But this is nothing when compared with the attempt to poison the very sources of the priesthood by compelling its aspirants to pass through the ordeals of the military service.

7. Military service has been in some measure compulsory ever since the wars of Napoleon I. But even when applied with most rigor, various classes of individuals were exempted, and, among others, priests and young aspirants in course of preparation for the priesthood, the exemption becoming final only by their ordination. It was the judgment of all fair-minded men that youths whose life was to be all turned to purity and piety should not be compelled to live amidst a coarse and licentious soldiery, and that anyhow a whole existence devoted to the service of their fellow-men was more than an equivalent for a few years of idleness spent in garrison with little beyond a bare possibility of active service.

But soon after the consolidation of the Republic, the cry was raised that priests and clerics should no longer be exempted. It was echoed through the country by those known for their hostility to religion, urged on by the radical newspapers, pressed on the

government by the anti-religious section of the legislature, and ultimately incorporated in the Army bill presented to the house. For the last few years this had been held as a threat over the heads of the clergy. The sense of the country was unfavorable to it. The military authorities opposed it. But the radical passions to which the government almost invariably yields were stronger still, and in the year 1890-91 the young seminarists took their place among the recruits of their section. How the measure has worked so far and is likely, if enforced, to work in the future, we are not concerned to examine. What we wish to point out is that it was carried out against the unanimous protests of bishops, priests and all practical Catholics, and in obedience to a feeling of undisguised hostility to clergy and religion in its originators and promoters from beginning to end.

8. The last grievance we wish to refer to regards the schools. Needless to say that with the Christian brothers and the teaching Sisters, all traces of religion were driven from them. The crucifixes were taken down from their walls and sometimes ignominiously thrown aside as worthless rubbish. Neither priest nor bishop may now visit them, except as strangers. Christian doctrine may not be taught on the premises, even after school hours. The textbooks enjoined are often objectionable. In the public schools of Paris the name of God has been expunged from every one of them. The normal schools in which teachers are trained are kept clear of all religious influences. It is barely tolerated in the government colleges, and the religious instruction is optional there. Clerics are strictly excluded from the educational boards, on which, as was natural, they held a place in former times. The school teachers are often notorious unbelievers, and not unfrequently give free expression in presence of their pupils to their contempt for all religious faith and practice. They may be occasionally reprimanded for their indiscretion. If they are removed, it is only to be promoted.

All this condition of things is only the carrying out of the programme laid down from the beginning by what was called the Republican party. If any of its members questioned its wisdom or fairness, he was looked upon with suspicion as a monarchist in disguise. Priests who spoke out against its iniquitous enactments were held up to public execration as enemies of their country. The very men who had done most by their moral authority to win enough wavering members to vote the republican constitution by a *majority of one* were soon set aside, and for the last ten years they have watched sadly the downward course of the movement they had originated and had hoped to guide, their promises disregarded, their wise checks and restraints brushed aside, and that

noble structure under which it was their ambition to welcome the whole nation and secure freedom to all, narrowed down to the size of a masonic lodge.

Can we wonder, then, that bishops and priests were unfriendly to such a régime—that it was still for them only on its trial, and that not successful nor with much likelihood to improve ;—that whilst submitting to the constituted authorities, their thoughts went forth in search of some other form of government which would give them not delusive hopes, but solid pledges of free action and fair play. The Republic had promised both, and if she had given them in any reasonable measure, she would have had no better friends than the clergy. But so long as she chose to do the very opposite, she could expect nothing beyond passive, unloving submission.

Hence the painful surprise awakened in almost the entire Catholic body in France by the appeal of Cardinal Lavigerie towards the close of 1890. It spoke of union in the midst of systematic persecution, of a hearty, unreserved adhesion to a form of government whose representatives had shown themselves almost invariably hostile to Catholic belief and Catholic influence. Submission indeed might be spoken of, had it not been practised as constantly as human nature could admit. But cordial, trustful affection ! It was like asking a man thrust out of doors to turn round and shake hands with his assailant. True, many of the clergy had been wanting in wisdom and moderation. But they were the aggrieved parties, and the question of peace remained entirely in the hands of the aggressors. Hence the appeal, whilst much spoken of in other countries, in France remained almost unheeded.

IV.

But here it will be asked—and in presence of the facts just described, the question has doubtless come up more than once before the mind of the reader—what inducement has the French Republic thus to wound the Catholic feeling of the country and make enemies for itself instead of friends ? And again, how can it have done so for years without being upset by the popular vote ? Perplexing questions indeed, not only for outsiders, but for the French themselves, as may be seen by the variety of answers elicited when the same questions are put to them. We will attempt to throw a little light on the problem in the following pages.

As regards the persistent hostility of the Republican party toward the Church, it can be accounted for in various ways, and first of all by the composition of that party. When, at the close of the war with Germany in 1871, the French people unanimously turned for guidance to their greatest living statesman, Thiers, in

presence of four or five irreconcilable political parties, he said, "I am satisfied to accept a republic. It is the form of government about which we shall disagree least. But I want a republic without the republicans." The republicans—the "true republicans," as they styled themselves, he dreaded, because, as a party, they were led by men of passionate temperament and of extreme radical, not to say revolutionary, principles, and followed by what was worst in the country. Now it is this very party that came to power twelve years ago, and has held its ground ever since. The weight of authority has, it is true, sobered down more than one of the leaders. But the original spirit remains in the body and is ever kept living and active by irresponsible members of the party. Most of them are devoid of all religious belief, some intensely hostile to the Catholic Church. It is only natural that they should injure her, as much as they can with safety to themselves and to their party.

The more moderate, considering her as an element of the political and social problem which it is out of their power to eliminate, would reduce her gradually to a vanishing quantity. Meanwhile they bear with her, but are ever ready to resent any special action or influence of hers in the sphere of public life. They would shut her up in her shrines, far out of sight, to be approached and consulted, like the oracles of old, by those who believe in her supernatural gifts, and leave the world to be guided by secular wisdom to its real end—the greatest and most widely diffused happiness attainable in the present life.

Even those—and there are some—who aim higher and realize the elevating power of the Church, still fail to recognize her divine mission and dread the development of influences positively and properly religious. They would have all the moral and social benefits of the faith, without the beliefs, the organization and the agencies to which they are due. Or if a Church there is to be, it must be a Church aiming at nothing and effecting nothing beyond what suits their purposes.

There is, finally, a large and steadily growing number of men, who, whilst regretting the radical tendencies of their party, and especially its hostility to religion, still cling to it for various reasons, and when it comes to a vote that may seem to imperil the new Republic, they vote with their party. Later on they may support a different policy, that is, when all danger shall have ceased and the republican form of government shall be no more questioned in France than a constitutional monarchy in England.

For it has to be remembered, at no time since it began has the republican constitution of France been out of danger. Up to the day of his untimely death, the Prince Imperial was looked to with

hope by a large section of the people. The intelligence and the wealth of the country have been for years with the Comte de Paris. The faults of the Republican party, the class of men they have put in office, their subserviency to the local politicians, and as a consequence, the weakness and one-sidedness of the whole administration, their lavish expenditure leading to increased taxes and repeated loans, kept as much as possible out of sight, yet clearly realized by the thoughtful as threatening national bankruptcy if not soon put an end to; and at the same time the impossibility that the party should stop its course without losing a support necessary to sustain them—all this and much more has shaken the faith of many who had originally believed in the Republic, and makes them still ready to accept any other form of government that would reassure them as to the future, rid them of arbitrary officials, of village tyrants, and not disgrace their country by placing some of her gravest interests in the hands of men whom they cannot respect.

Add to all this the innate and undying love of the French people for military glory, and their readiness to forget all else for a time, to follow a brilliant and successful soldier, and we can understand how even a man like Boulanger could have had such a following in all classes and all through the country; how the government felt itself on the very brink of destruction, and only escaped by the boldness of its action and the cowardice of the would-be dictator. It is only natural that in such a condition of things the government and the republican majority should look suspiciously on the clergy whose sympathies they had estranged, and decide upon crushing instead of conciliating them.

V.

But then the other question comes up: how *can* they crush them? Is not France a Catholic country? and if so, how, with its manhood suffrage, can it allow its convictions to be ignored, its religious institutions to be broken up, the beneficent action of the clergy impeded at every step, by a government which is of its own making, after all, and utterly dependent on its votes? Or are we to believe that France is only Catholic in name, and that the work of religious destruction which has been pursued is after all only what she consciously or unconsciously wishes for?

The question is a fair one and should be answered fairly. But fairness here means more than superficial observation and misleading generalizations. The anomaly we have to deal with, like most social facts, has its roots deep down in the nature of the people and in its living memories and traditions. It is the outcome of

many present influences, some permanent, others transient and accidental.

We would say then, first, that the French are a Catholic people, but only in a very qualified sense. It is clear that if they were a Catholic people as the Irish, or Belgians, or Spaniards, or as the Catholic population of the United States, none of the religious grievances referred to above could have ever come into existence. In reality the religious condition of France is something very complex and difficult to analyze and describe with anything like accuracy. In France are to be found in large numbers some of the noblest specimens of Christian faith and life the world possesses. Beside them are some of the worst and bitterest enemies of all religion. There are whole provinces where nearly the entire population is heartily Catholic in belief and in practice. There are others where the churches are unfrequented, the sacraments hardly thought of, except by a few women, the priest appealed to only on rare and solemn occasions. Many old religious customs are still kept up, but there is no longer any clear conception or firm hold of the beliefs which give a meaning to them. Up to a recent period, very few failed to receive, when young, their share of the religious instruction so carefully given to children. But, unsupported by domestic and social influences, these early religious impressions are neither deep nor abiding, and each succeeding generation emerges into manhood, sometimes,—in the cities—openly irreligious, but mostly indifferent, skeptical, deistical at best, with a traditional tinge of Christianity. They are not bad men, as a rule; the rural population are hard-working, thrifty, honest in their dealings, kindly withal and helpful to their neighbors. They would make fairly good Protestants; but that is the last thing they would think of. They like to have a priest, the same as the people around them, to baptize their children, to marry their sons and daughters, to anoint themselves when the end is near and they are already unconscious, and to bury them respectably from the church when they die. Such people, though all baptized, we can hardly call Christians.

Finally, in most parts of France we find the two classes mingled in varying proportions. In cities and towns the contrast between them is more marked, the religious section being more demonstrative in its faith, and the unbelieving more openly hostile.

Taking the whole population of the country as it stands, a legislature faithfully reflecting its feeling towards religion would not be unfriendly to the Church. But in this as in many other particulars, the popular vote does not reflect the popular mind. Issues unfamiliar and confusing are artfully introduced to mislead the voter. His ignorance is abused, his credulity played upon, and the result is the return to the legislature of men who, if known,

would never have won his confidence. The truth is, the French voter, as a rule, has no political education. In country places he seldom reads a newspaper; in the cities he finds them in abundance, but almost invariably chooses the worst. Nobody accustomed to the press of this country can form any conception of the utter unfairness and disregard for truth which characterize the organs of the French press most widely circulated among the lower classes. The silliest reports are given as ascertained facts. Insinuations of the worst kind are indulged in, inconvenient happenings carefully kept out of sight, others eagerly grasped at and magnified, in a word a travestied picture of things steadily held up before their readers.

As a consequence, the bulk of the people have only a very imperfect and incorrect conception of the issues involved in an election or of the men who solicit their suffrage, and thus become an easy prey to the unscrupulous agents and candidates who work themselves into their confidence. The worst feature in them is that they distrust their natural guides. The masses in France will not listen to political advice coming from any one above them unless he makes himself as one of them. An employer of labor may be ever so kind to his workmen and on the best terms with them. On election day they are sure to vote for the candidate he most objects to. In many places the priest shares in the same distrust. He must not talk politics to his people. It will not influence their vote to any extent and they count it as an unwarrantable intrusion. But the government officials spread all over the country are expected to do their utmost for the government candidate, and many of them know that their position, present and prospective, depends on his success.

Thus it comes to pass that even a good Catholic population will send up to the legislature a representative hostile to religion. He finds little difficulty in calming their conscientious scruples. He pledges himself on the one hand that no harm shall be done to religion, and on the other he holds out, if successful, the most tempting prospects of government favors—roads, bridges, railway extensions, appointments of all kinds.

But the popular interests are appealed to in another and a broader way. The French peasantry, who form the bulk of the population, are, as we have said, hard working, orderly, and anticipate nothing but trouble from any political change. Security of person and property being about all they expect from the best of governments, so long as they enjoy it and are doing fairly well, they hate the very notion of a change. In other words, whether they live under an emperor, a king or a president, they are intensely conservative. As a consequence, even though a government can-

didate be deficient in many ways and far less estimable than his opponent, they will vote for him and not for the one who would upset the government, make trouble, bring on war perhaps, and other calamities known and unknown besides. The priests it is true, complain, they say, but so far their salary has not been withdrawn. Anyhow they are well able to take care of themselves, and people are not going to upset everything to please them.

Yet all this could not sufficiently account for the fact of the radicals remaining in power so long, though a minority in the country, if we did not add one more all-important factor—the existence in the radical party, of a strong, wide-spread, well disciplined organization, and the failure of the conservative party to establish anything to compete with it.

The republicans in the legislature are divided among themselves on many points, but on most others, especially on the fundamental dogma of republican institutions they are in perfect agreement, work together, under the recognized leadership of a few among them, and are ever ready to sacrifice their own judgment to the general interests of the party and the guidance of its chiefs. Outside the house, they have built up a powerful press, in Paris and in every part of the country. They have extended a network of agencies, more or less connected with freemasonry, over the whole surface of the land, and are thus able to disseminate all manner of impressions favorable to their cause, prepare elections, local and general, dispose the public mind for or against certain measures in contemplation. Finally, they have shown remarkable energy and perseverance in carrying out their programme, in individual instances a great devotion to the cause, in short a political spirit not unworthy of nations long accustomed to popular government.

The conservative party have tried to organize in a similar way, but without any great success. Their difficulties it is true were greater. Conservatism itself was too shadowy a basis to build upon. Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists, all monarchists, could not agree on the monarchs to recognize. The defence of religious interests was a platform good enough and clear enough in its way, but insufficient, without a political programme, to keep a political party together. And when an attempt was made to carry out the so-called religious policy, it was found that instead of new men, only the champions of past years were forthcoming—honorable and true, but having no records except of failure, and as was said, "only monarchists in disguise." Besides they had no recognized leader at any time, no man strong enough to impose a policy and compel obedience. Outside the legislature there were some desultory attempts to enlighten the public by the diffusion of prints and newspapers. But here again the radical vice of the

system was felt—the absence of a political programme. The various factions worked principally for their own purposes. Up to the death of the Comte de Chambord, the legitimists were irreconcilable. For them no political or religious change deserved attention unless it led to a restoration which, once effected, would prove a universal remedy.

The spirit of compromise—the very essence of political combination—is strikingly deficient in the French character, and on no occasion has its absence been more distinctly and painfully felt than in the inability of the conservatives to merge their differences in a common effort to rid the country of a rule which they all agreed to look upon as disastrous and debasing. Whilst their opponents were weak, they quarrelled among themselves; when at last they attempted to combine, it was too late. Even among the clergy, there was no pliancy, no unity of action, no guidance. The bishops were not agreed on any definite policy, and the counsels that came from Rome were rather of a negative kind and only served to dishearten the more resolute among them. On the other hand, such of the clergy as were accessible to worldly considerations were paralyzed at the very outset; for any active opposition to the policy of the government was sure to close against them all access to ecclesiastical preferment dependent upon State sanction. It is true their fault, as a body, does not lie in that direction. It is rather in their extreme, uncompromising spirit, more generous than enlightened, and wasting itself too often on impracticable, unattainable ends.

It is in the midst of this condition of things that the Declaration of Cardinals already referred to was published. What seems to have attracted most attention outside France is their recommendation to the Catholic clergy and laity "to accept henceforth, without reservation the political institutions of the country." But for those familiar with the real state of affairs, this could not mean much. To recommend a passive acceptance of present institutions would be superfluous, inasmuch as they are enforced by the whole power of the law; neither is there any prospect of their being altered in the near future sufficient to justify an open constitutional agitation against them. But if, by unreserved acceptance is meant abandonment of all hope, or wish, or readiness to strive for another form of government, if ever a chance offered, we doubt very much whether the believers in a monarchy will take the advice to heart, or whether even the clergy, whilst more reserved in showing to which side they lean, will feel bound henceforth to relinquish their personal judgment and personal sympathies. Neither are the relations with the Republican party and with the government likely to be much modified. For the Cardinals invite protest and active oppo-

sition to the vexatious legislation of which we have spoken whilst Republican organs continue to look upon these very laws as essential elements of a genuine republic, and cabinet Ministers formally state before the Senate that they consider them as "an integral and accessory part of the great work which they slowly and deliberately elaborated since they came to power—never to be touched again."

Thus, then, the attempt at pacification promises to lead to nothing, and it only remains for the Church to keep up the fight. Happily she can do so with every chance of ultimate success, if only she decides to pursue it on other lines.

VI.

Recent experience has taught her that even a legal recognition of her claims can give no permanent security, unless it is based on the abiding sense of the country. What one legislature grants another can take away. She has found out that there is such a thing as being too successful, and that it is better to get less with the good will of all, than by getting more to awaken opposition and enmity. Looking back to the period immediately following the war with Germany, it is manifest that the majority in the legislature was far more Catholic than the country at large; that the claims of the clergy grew in proportion with the readiness of that majority to meet them; and that, although the concessions effectively made were anything but exorbitant, still they were calculated to alarm a people extremely sensitive to religious pressure. At the same time the action of the clergy, instead of being quiet and unobtrusive, was often demonstrative, not to say noisy and aggressive, in a way which could not fail to lead to a reaction. Many who, though with little or no belief themselves, had a genuine respect for religion and would find no fault with those who practised it sincerely, were roused to opposition when they witnessed what they called an attempt to capture the country and impose a purely Catholic régime on a people so deeply divided in the matter of religious beliefs. The feeling was naturally intensified in those openly opposed to all Christian faith, and unhappily the two classes together included a large majority of the active and militant political men of the country. Gambetta was their leader, and he it was that raised the alarm by pointing out clerical ascendancy as the peril of the hour. "*Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi*" became the watchword and the war-cry of the party, and led step by step to all those repressive and hostile measures which we have set before our readers. Some of the worst would have probably not been carried if the clergy had been more prudent and more careful to deal gently with public opinion,

to gauge it more accurately and to cultivate it with greater assiduity and tact.

But this would be perhaps expecting too much. The French clergy, as a body—and, indeed, the same may be said of the great majority of educated Frenchmen—are strangely ignorant of the true condition of public opinion on questions which divide the country. They read the papers of their party and will read no others. In reality they do not want to know the full truth. It is far pleasanter to be told that all is right on their side and wrong on that of their opponents. Facts the most significant and tendencies leading to the greatest results reach them, if at all, in an imperfect and often distorted shape. And because they see not far, they invariably picture to themselves the whole country merely as an enlargement of the surroundings with which they are familiar. It is not easy for most priests to go farther. The hostile papers are so unfair that it is difficult to extract the honest truth from them. And then a priest who reads them and gathers broadness and moderation from them is liable to be looked upon with suspicion by his fellow priests and by the "right-minded" people with whom he associates. The intolerance of both classes in this particular, especially of the former, goes beyond anything a born American can form a conception of.

And yet public opinion, in France as in all modern countries, is the great Court of Appeal before which all disputed cases of public policy have to come up for a final decision. The supreme power has gone back to its original human source—the people. It is they that have ultimately to be dealt with, and, if possible, to be won. In his letter to Cardinal Gibbons in relation to the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Manning remarks that the Church formerly dealt with princes, because in them resided what there was of authority. But gradually power has forsaken the throne and dwelt with lords and parliaments until it has come down to the lower strata of society. "And now," he says, "a new task is before us. The Church has no longer to deal with parliaments and princes, but with the masses and with the people. Whether we will or no, this is our work. We need a new spirit and a new law of life." Our readers will remember how nobly and feelingly the American Cardinal echoed the pregnant words of his venerable brother of Westminster.

Here, then, is a lesson well deserving to be taken to heart by all, and above all by the Clergy of France. For, if we may say it, they are not as much in sympathy with the people as in other Catholic countries, surely not as much as they possibly might and should be.

That they love their people, that they are devoted to their in

terests, spiritual and temporal, self-forgetting in their service and helpful whenever appealed to, nobody knowing them will be tempted to deny. In fact, as priests, the people give them credit for being all they ought to be, and sincerely reverence and trust them in their official capacity. But men are concerned about many things besides their souls and their bodies. They want to be understood, appreciated, to find sympathy in those with whom they have to deal, not for what is admittedly evil, but for what they look upon as most desirable and best. Such are for them their political and social ideals, their aspirations to liberty, to freedom of action and thought, to a share in the direction of public affairs, general and local, equality, dislike of unlimited, arbitrary or irresponsible power, freedom of the press, a right to organize labor and combine for all legitimate purposes. These and many other objects of a similar kind captivate the popular mind. In a certain measure they are all legitimate and many of them positively beneficent. Beyond that they are an evil and from the beginning they are a danger, because of the facility with which they run into excess. Now the people have a lively sense of what is good in them and can scarce see anything else. The priest, on the contrary, ever on the watch to ward off evil, can hardly see anything but the perils they lead to. He is accordingly induced to throw the whole weight of his influence against them, and thus finds himself out of sympathy with the people, whilst seeking only to be faithful to his duty.

But his conception of duty in this regard may often be a mistaken one. A broader view of things might lead him to opposite conclusions. It would certainly show him that to hope, and trust, and reckon on the power of patience and love, is not less a duty than to restrain or to rebuke; that the dominant tendencies of an age cannot be stayed; that, like the mountain torrent, accumulated obstacles only add to their destructive power, and that the only thing possible is to limit and to guide them. But limitation and guidance are accepted only from those whose sympathies are undoubted.

This, we know, is the secret of the power which the popular leaders of the day exercise over their followers. They are in touch with them. They share, or seem to share, all their aspirations. They give expression and power to the principles and the impulses dimly and dumbly moving in the popular mind. This manner of action is ever open to the priest and only through it can he reach the hearts of the people. The sacredness of his character and his virtuous life may win the respect of a religious population, not unfrequently even of unbelievers. But only a clergy that shares their joys, their hopes, the secret longings of their

hearts, can ever be their acknowledged guides. The case of Ireland comes up of itself before the mind as an example. But the same is true of Belgium, of Catholic Germany, of every other country where priests and people have fought together for faith and for Church. The religious bond alone would not have sufficed to keep them united in action. There had to be, besides, the human element of common interests and common sympathies—what the Hebrew prophet calls “The cords of Adam—the bands of love.”

In one sense nothing should be easier to the French clergy; for although all classes of society are represented among them, as a body they spring from the people; in infancy and in early youth at least, they have thought and felt and hoped and feared with the people. Later on, it is true, other influences have come and gradually weakened the bond. They have been taken and cast into a mould in which not a few precious elements of their earlier life too often disappeared. It is the danger of all schools of special training, whatever their object, to disregard, not only the antecedent mental and moral conditions of those they undertake to form, but even the full scope of their future action, in order to fit them the better for the one principal function at which they aim. But the results are often unsatisfactory. Such schools make artists, engineers, soldiers, priests. They often fail to make men. Yet a priest has to remain to the end a man, and a man of the people, like the Son of Man, his Master and Model, who chose to embrace all human sympathies in his heart, “to be made like unto his brethren, as St. Paul says, tempted in all things as we are, without sin . . . that he might become a merciful and faithful high-priest before God.” Through youth and early manhood, during the whole course of his training, whilst opening widely his soul to the spirit of the Gospel and to the traditional spirit of the Catholic priesthood, the aspirant has to keep alive his first love for what is good and generous and hopeful in the age and in the people to which he belongs. Thus he may go back to them, not as one who has imbibed the prejudices of a foreign country and forgotten his native tongue, but as one who returns to a home which he has never ceased to think of and to love.

This the priests of France are coming to realize, slowly it is true, but steadily. Once fully alive to the fact, they will act on it, and with that wonderful pliancy which they have exhibited as missionaries all over the world, making themselves at home amid the most varied forms and degrees of civilization, and winning numberless souls to Christ, “of all nations and tribes and peoples and tongues,” surely the task of accommodating themselves to the prevailing spirit of their own people will prove an easy and a pleasant one.

The difficulty will be to persevere after the first attempts will have failed to awaken a responsive echo. For they will not unfrequently find between them and the hearts of the people a crust of prejudice often hard to break and ever ready to re-form. Strange to say, there prevails very widely through the country a sort of mysterious fear or distrust of the priest—not of the individual priest, but of the clergy. It is almost entirely confined to the lower classes, and is often half unconscious. If questioned, they may honestly deny it, and if they acknowledge, they cannot justify it. But it is there, just like the feeling of so many Protestants in this country regarding Catholics and their priests, nothing in particular to object to, perhaps much to admire—but, behind it all, a suspicion of secret, dangerous combinations and aims which have to be watched, whilst the operators must be made powerless to do harm. How such a feeling came to be implanted in a Catholic people, it is extremely difficult to explain. It is doubtless in a measure a lingering tradition of the now distant past in which the economic interests of the clergy and of the people were antagonistic and conflicting; doubtless also it is somewhat due to the very separateness in which the priest has to live, and to the awkwardness naturally felt by so many men committed by baptism and outward profession to a religion which they do not choose to practise. The temperament also of the nation, trustful to a fault, yet as Carlyle remarks, preternaturally suspicious, once suspicion is awakened, helps to account for it. And last, but not least, there is the silly yet abiding apprehension of priests getting power and using it to compel people to be religious whether they like it or not.

Whatever the cause, the effect is there. For many a good and noble-hearted priest it has been the hardest of burdens to bear, and it will remain, so long as it lasts, the difficulty most dreaded by those who come to the people with hearts full of sympathy and love.

Another, keenly felt in many places and hard to remove, arises from the unfriendly relations so prevalent in France between “the masses and the classes.” It is the natural wish of the priest to be on good terms with both. His relations with the old French families, especially, are of a kind to compensate for what is denied him elsewhere. It is one of genuine mutual confidence. In the priest they find a man of education with whom they may converse on many topics, a safe and convenient channel for their charities, in times of emergency and trial, a guide and a friend. In return, their thoughtful kindness is ever adding to the beauty of his church and to the modest comforts of his home. He is at all times their welcome guest. But his acceptance of their hospi-

tality easily becomes a popular grievance. Whoever associates with them is supposed to side with them, and as a consequence, comes in for his share of the distrust and dislike with which they are regarded—often most unjustly—by the lower classes.

To steer an even course between the two parties until he has reconciled them together will require tact, patience and self-forgetting in no ordinary degree. But then there is no other body of men who more than the clergy of France can be looked to with assurance for the generous practice of such virtues.

To conclude: Church and State in France have been and still remain at war. The nature of that war, its causes and responsibilities we have endeavored to set before the reader as accurately and as fully as possible. The picture is not a bright one. To some of our readers it will seem disheartening. But those who know the country best, do not share that feeling. *Violentum non durat* is a proverb of universal truth, but doubly true of the French people. And there is in them besides a sort of undying youth underlying the seeming tokens of decay, which may burst forth any day in forms of life as new and beautiful as unexpected. In France it is really the unexpected that happens.

Hence, whilst there is much reason to be sad, there is far less to be discouraged. In what way France may recover herself religiously men can only conjecture. Separation between Church and State are just now much spoken of. Neither the Pope nor the French government are favorable to it. But there is a power in the very condition of things which overrules the strongest wills.

One thing seems certain. This time the Republic has come to stay, and only the greatest faults can henceforth imperil its existence. The only practical course open to the Church is that suggested by Leo XIII., and clearly pointed out by the Cardinals; to bow to the constitution once for all, and then, by the broadness of her sympathies and by her deep, untiring, unselfish love, to win back the loyalty and trust of a people whose pride for centuries it has been to do God's work under her guidance, "*gesta Dei per Francos*."

J. HOGAN.

P. S.—Since the above was written, two important events have emphasized the cross-currents of contemporary history in France, but so far without sensibly modifying their direction: we refer to the recent Papal Encyclical addressed on the 16th of February "to the Catholic Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of France," and to the bill on "Associations" which led recently to the fall of the French Ministry. In his Encyclical Leo XIII. gives public and solemn expression to the policy which he has been known to

favor for a long time, and which he was wont to recommend to those who sought to be guided by his wisdom. The document is in substantial agreement with the manifesto of the Cardinals and Bishops, recognizing in general terms the reality of the grievances they set forth, and summoning the Catholics of the country to unite with them in resenting and resisting the anti-religious laws enacted in the course of these latter years. But, whilst in the episcopal document the political question is kept in the background and touched upon lightly, it becomes the prominent feature of the Pontifical announcement. Drawing a distinction between the Constitution which France has acquiesced in and clings to, and the course of anti-religious legislation which is being pursued, Leo XIII. declares that the former should be respected, but that all should unite in combating the latter.

That much good will come of this wise and timely advice, there can be no doubt; in fact it is already visible in many shapes, which at the last moment we cannot stop to consider. Yet in no degree does it seem to have disarmed the hostility of the "Republican" party towards the Church. Indeed the salutary warnings of the Pope as to the essential dependence of social order on morality, and ultimately on Religion, would appear to irritate them more and more.

Their feelings have found a natural expression in the bill presented by the Government on "Associations" in general, but unmistakably meant to give a fatal blow to all religious societies. If voted by the legislature, it would have placed every religious body in the country, and ultimately the Church herself at the mercy of a power, arbitrary, unscrupulous and openly hostile.

For the present it is dropped. But the spirit which dictated its insidious clauses is as much alive and as active as ever. After a few days of ministerial crisis, the same men, with two or three exceptions, came back to power, and their attitude towards the Church is in nowise improved. The formal acceptance of the Republican Constitution by the Pope and Bishops has not in the least altered the feelings or the language of their party. Catholics are plainly told by the radical press that their sympathies are neither sought for nor believed in. The latest accounts tell of fresh threats uttered by the new premier and of fresh acts of petty tyranny. It remains to be seen whether the country consulted in the next elections will ratify such action.

J. H.

THE LAST OF THREE GREAT ENGLISH
CARDINALS—HIS SPECIAL WORK.

WHEN Napoleon the First was at St. Helena, withering in his miserable exile, he had a conversation with an attendant about "greatness," or as to what constituted the true idea of being "great." He said that our Divine Lord was truly great, because He succeeded in making the whole human family love Him; but that, for himself, he could not claim any greatness, since his career had inspired fear, but not love. We can imagine "Napoleon the Great" regarding his whole life as a failure, because he would die with scarcely one friend to regret him. Not greatness but smallness was such an end. And it has been the end of not a few of the world's heroes. The number of those great ones who have been great in the world's love, has been less even than of those whom the world respected. Mere respect is often rendered to mere success; but the world gives its heart to the good alone.

A great man has recently died in England, whose greatness was emphatically his goodness. Cardinal Manning was not revered for his grand abilities, nor was he renowned as a great preacher or public orator; nor was he looked upon as a commanding figure on this world's stage, nor as an embodiment of any captivating idea. In all such aspects he was far away above ordinary men; still, he could only be said to be "typical" as to his asceticism. He was profoundly esteemed for the splendid charities of his career; for the grand activities of his generous nature and saintly soul; for the holy example he set of a self-denying life; and, above all, for his championship of the poor. If we ask, what was that one sovereign trait which endeared Cardinal Manning to the multitude, so much so as to make him "great in the world's love," we shall find the answer in many scores of "resolutions" which were passed by Laborers' Unions in Great Britain, so soon as it became known that he was dead; resolutions all conveying the profound regret at the loss of a friend who "had endeared himself to the heart of every working man by the profound interest he ever exhibited in his welfare," or, "by the noble earnestness with which he fought the cause of the oppressed," or, "by his championship of the just rights of the laboring classes." Here was the real secret of the "greatness." The name of Manning was as a household word with the English poor, and this, perhaps, equally among Protestants and among Catholics.

Let us recall, for a moment, two other English cardinals, both of whom were profoundly venerated by Catholics. It has been

well said, that "Cardinal Newman helped to intellectually convert Englishmen, while Cardinal Manning helped to socially convert them." Both succeeded—in the fullest measure that was practicable. And, to go one step further back—for we must render justice to the long-dead—the three England-influencing cardinals of the nineteenth century have each admirably fulfilled the mission that was appointed to him. Cardinal Wiseman, braving the *odium theologicum*, the unreasoning Protestant hatred of the Catholic religion, succeeded in impressing Englishmen with this "new idea:" That the Catholic faith and a high intelligence might be compatible. But intellectual honesty is not the same thing with a high intelligence; and, while every one conceded to Wiseman splendid gifts, his friends alone were quite convinced of his ingenuousness. He was looked upon by English Protestants as a crafty emissary of a foreign power, whose main duty was to delude the English by fine scholarship. He stood the storm of the Protestant abuse with admirable calm. He published books, he edited plays, he lectured widely, he wrote to the newspapers; but he seemed to realize that his painful mission was to "prepare the way," not to reap, to taste the fruits, to enjoy the reward. Yet, without *his* mission, the cardinals who followed him might have been failures. When Monsignor Manning became the second Cardinal Archbishop, the English mind, so to speak, had been "led up to it." The red robe was now familiar and did not offend. A born Englishman, the son of a wealthy member of parliament, who had at one time been a Governor of the Bank of England, a public-school man, and an Oxford-class man, the intimate friend of Anglican dignitaries, and himself a quondam-archdeacon of Chichester, Dr. Manning became a sort of English realization of the foreign idea known before only as "Wiseman." It must be admitted, therefore, that he started on his new career with what may be called comparatively high advantages. Yet no one suspected what the *future* Manning would become when age should ripen his knowledge and experience. It was thought that he would be a dignified ecclesiastic; possibly, a favorite with the upper classes, or even at Court; but was it imagined that he would become a great social reformer; that he would completely change the hostile attitude of society towards the Catholic Church and towards Catholics; that he would accomplish what no English Catholic had yet looked for—the conversion of the Protestant mind to the calm assurance of Catholic loyalty in all political, social, commercial, and ethical grooves; that he would die having made his countrymen believe in Catholics, though they might not, perhaps, wholly believe in the Catholic religion? No such future was confidently predicted for "Monsignor Manning." He was supposed only to be a "first-

rate second-rate man." He turned out to be the most useful Catholic of his century.

Yet he was aided, profoundly aided, in his achievement by the side-by-side mission of John Henry Newman. There were two "new views" which Dr. Newman had taught his countrymen a dozen years before Monsignor Manning was made cardinal; the one, that the Catholic religion might be intellectually "not un-English," and the other that it might be, morally, ingenuous. Yet there still remained the inheritance of three centuries of prejudice, which has poisoned the life-blood of English *social* first principles; perhaps even the "social" more than the "religious" first principles, as every one who knows the English character can understand. John Bull is an islander, spite of his boast of world-wideness; nor can he wholly throw off his painfully social insularity. He has immensely widened himself in the last thirty years by travel, and by the observation of the habits of foreigners in his own country; still, he is an Englishman first, and a cosmopolitan afterwards, if indeed he ever becomes a citizen of the world. Now this social failing has made him dull to Catholic appeal. He is quite as religious, perhaps, as are other people in his disposition; yet the religion which he professes must be English, for otherwise it cannot possibly be the right thing. Cardinal Manning taught him that the Catholic religion was English. And how he taught it, we may profitably consider for a few moments.

"Let it be granted"—such had been the postulate of English Protestantism between the years 1600–1840—"that the Catholic religion is not only inimical to God's truth but is fatal to loyalty, to honesty, to sincerity, to all social and domestic security and peace." The Catholic religion was therefore, postulately, un-English! And to prove a postulate to be an absurdity is a much more difficult task than to prove the falsity of an inference from a given premise. Indeed, a fact is the only vanquisher of a false postulate. Such a fact was forthcoming some forty years ago in the conversion to the Catholic religion of such highly reputed Englishmen as Frederick Faber, Ambrose de Lisle, Archdeacon Wilberforce, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Hope Scott, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Oakley, Mr. Allies, and many others; not to single out that "Anglican conversione," John Henry Newman, or that "Xavier of the Church of England," Archdeacon Manning. Still, we had not seen the "working out" of this hard fact, until time showed whether all the converts were not mistaken. "Place one of these distinguished converts in a high position," we might imagine the old-fashioned Protestant to have said: "Where he can do himself and his religion full justice, and let us then see whether the Protestant postulate will not be justified." So Archdeacon Manning mounted the throne of an arch-

bishop. A quarter of a century was the trying term of his probation. And in that term he did five things all well, all successfully, which dethroned the Protestant postulate ; indeed, killed it.

Let us briefly enumerate these five successes :

1. Politically, Cardinal Manning united Irish and English Catholics in a bond of brotherhood that did not exist before his time. He was known to be a Home Ruler ; yet, apart from this conviction, he worked for harmony between two races which, by " historic accidents," had become unhappily divided ; and worked so well, that whereas, in the days of Cardinal Wiseman, an Irishman was as much of a foreigner as a Frenchman, there is now positively no discord nor estrangement. This of itself was no mean political service. But now to speak of his political influence with the British government. Political influence is not to be gauged by what is read or what is printed ; it is a secret and a quietly permeating force ; and not a few members of two ministries have let it be known among their acquaintance with what respect they had weighed the cardinal's wise counsel. Nor is it easy to draw the line between the highest social influence and such influence as is commonly called political. For example, if the cardinal could impress the government with the wisdom of his own views on both Catholic and denominational education, on the whole programme of social reform, on the legitimate organization of labor, on the duties of the State to the impoverished classes, and, above all, on the political justice due to Ireland, it is obvious that such influence, though indirect, was political ; and, as a matter of fact, it was so accepted. Or again, if to the *Times* newspaper the cardinal could write lucidly, and very frequently, upon many a branch of political economy ; always bravely battling for the side of the working classes, yet at the same time distinguishing broadly between such claims as were industrial, and a fictitious and also unjust modern socialism ; it is obvious that such influence was didactic and operative, and therefore in real sense political. And once more, though the root of the matter is perhaps social, still its effects or its consequences are semi-political ; if the Cardinal could bring it about that it is now recognized as an acquired right that Catholic priests shall take their place on boards of guardians, on Mansion House Committees, and on all occasions where public interests are concerned, we may argue that, forasmuch as before the Cardinal's days, no such rights were ever conceded nor even demanded, we have to thank the Cardinal for such new privileges as are quasi-political, for such social powers as trench closely on the administrative.

2. More easy is it to show that the cardinal's purely social successes have been remarkable both for their breadth and their vitality. To have succeeded in reconciling English Protestants to

this hypothesis: that the highest Catholic ecclesiastic in the realm might be also the leading English philanthropist, the most potent of the friends of the industrial classes, the ablest patron of distinctively English institutions, and the most practical of the reformers of the intemperate, was a huge conquest over prejudice, which might have seemed impracticable to born Catholics, but which has been quietly achieved by "one of the converts." And what the cardinal gained for himself he gained for others. All Englishmen are now accustomed to read of Catholic bishops and Catholic priests "taking the chair" at festal gatherings or celebrations; nor is there any protest against the favors or even the preferences which are shown by official persons to known Catholics. Finally, in the ordinary social or domestic life Catholics are as welcome in drawing-rooms as are non-Catholics; in the London clubs there is no prejudice, no inquiry; in the city, or in public offices, the subject is never pressed—save, indeed, by an exceptionally narrow-minded few; while among the Anglican clergy there is not any apparent predisposition to avoid a man because he has "turned Catholic." To whom do English Catholics owe these changes? Not, of course, to any one man by himself. They could no more be ascribed to an individual than to a religious order; to a cardinal or a priest than to a distinguished layman. They are the result of the gradual reforming of the social spirit. Yet, perhaps, we may say this much confidently: that Cardinal Manning, more than any man, taught the upper and the middle classes that the Christian religion must be firmly based upon natural religion; and that the first principle of natural religion being universal kindness, the Catholic religion necessarily carries that principle to perfection. It was this conviction, deeply implanted by Cardinal Manning (of whom it was well said by a dissenting minister, "the Cardinal's politics are those of his Divine Master, for they begin with the universal brotherhood of mankind, and make the loving our neighbor as ourself to be the only real proof that we love God"), which made Englishmen to look admiringly upon this *social* side of Catholicity, and so to open their hearts, as well as their doors, to active Catholics. For the English people of all classes having a deep respect for real beneficence, esteeming charity, in all its phases, as divinely virtuous, and giving their warmest homage to those who are proved to be the "friends of man," naturally *believed in* Cardinal Manning, who let it be known to all the world that "natural religion was born of the Eternal Father." May it be said that because the Cardinal *began* with natural religion; insisting, that unless a man obliged his natural conscience he would not be worthy to receive the supernatural enlightenment; the English people respected that "sound common sense" which did not talk

about flying before you can walk. The Cardinal was believed in because he was "a man"; not a speculative spiritual theorist who taught in the clouds, or preached a religion which was a delicate spiritual exotic; but who maintained that the highest grace of nature was unselfishness, and that Christianity is really the perfecting of that grace.

3. It would take a volume to describe what the Cardinal did for education. There would be three grooves in which he could work for education: (1) among the poor; (2) among the middle classes and (3) among the clergy. His own education, begun at Harrow, continued at Baliol college, Oxford, whence he graduated in first-class classical honors; and it may be said, too, matured in that after-atmosphere of educatedness in which he lived for many years as an Anglican dignitary, enriched him with that "man of the world" kind of knowledge which enabled him to cope with every antagonist. And first, as to the education of the poorer classes, we may quote the words of Sir H. Francis Sandford, addressed on the recent "Jubilee Day" to His Eminence: "I feel from my heart that if England is to remain a Christian country, so far as education is concerned, the happy result will be largely due to Your Eminence." How shall we put together in few words the vast results? Thus: of thousands of Catholic children rescued from the gutters; schools, orphanages, homes, reared for them in all parts of the country; forty-nine new departments in elementary schools, with an increase in the daily attendance of many thousands; and so great a peace and discipline reigning among these schools that a London newspaper has asked in a leading article, "What is the subtle charm of Roman Catholicism that it can make the lowest classes of children look so refined?" Such has been a fraction of that Catholic school-work which has built up a new Catholic generation. And if we say a word, too, of the middle or the upper-class education, it is manifest that we must associate it with that increase in Catholic seminaries which has created so many perfectly new opportunities. Indeed, the education of the students for the priesthood must come closely into connection with this subject; so much so that we may speak of the clerical and of the higher lay education as being necessarily sympathetic and inter-auxiliary. Now, it is quite remarkable what a number of new theological seminaries have sprung up under Cardinal Manning's initiation. The admirable St. Thomas' Seminary, from which about two hundred priests have already issued, cost English Catholics about two hundred thousand dollars; while about forty students are in residence at the new College of St. Nicholas; and as to the new religious communities for men, there are forty-nine, most of which aid in some degree educationally; the Sisters, too, of the active orders

contributing their daily service to the education of the younger feminine generation. There is no need to add more upon this subject than that the advance of Catholic education in England has been parallel with the advance of the Catholic religion. And on this last point—though we will speak of the Cardinal's work only—it may suffice to mention these few facts:

(4.) Forty-five new Catholic churches in the Westminster diocese, besides a generous sprinkling of small missions, have been founded and completed within thirty years; (2) ten thousand additional Catholic children attend the schools; (3) two thousand orphans are housed and religiously tended; (4) the number of Easter communicants has advanced within the same period from fifty-three to eighty-five thousand.

Lastly (5), one word must be added on the League of the Cross, founded by the severely ascetical Cardinal Manning. There is probably no country in which the temptations to inebriety are so gross and so numerous as they are in England; gross, because of the vile nature of the stimulants, and numerous in regard to the ubiquity of the public houses. About one-half of the members of the House of Lords own fifteen hundred public houses between them, from which fact may be inferred the popularity of such kind of property among the classes who have idle capital for investment. More than two-thirds of the crime in Great Britain is fathered by this "prince of sources of the revenue," so that, as a member of the House of Commons once observed, "the great public institutions of this country are largely maintained by inciting to vice." Now, Cardinal Manning was not the first to see the truth, that a national evil must be met by a national sacrifice; yet he was one of the first to impress this principle on English society: "The best way to stop a poisonous growth is to pluck out the roots." He therefore heroically advocated a self-denial by *all* persons as the best way of discouraging indulgence by *many* persons. The principle has been argued for and against; nor need we now speak of it save only in one bearing, and that bearing is the proved, practical results. Thousands of Catholic families have been saved, domestically, by total abstinence; while, as to the country generally, the noble example has been followed, and scores of public houses have closed their doors. Thus, at the cost of a considerable amount of personal enjoyment,—of perfectly legitimate and often salutary enjoyment,—the example set by the Cardinal has been followed by vast numbers, who, not being at all disposed themselves to intemperance, have made a real sacrifice to save others.

II.

Thus far we have glanced at the career of Cardinal Manning in its relation to the outer word,—to whole communities. Let us

now think of him in spheres which were more circumscribed, or which were narrowed by purely Catholic sympathies. As a writer, an author, the Cardinal held a front rank, from the ease and perspicuity of his composition. In this respect he was not unlike Cardinal Newman, though doubtless he had more of the simplicity of Addison than of the depth and power of the great oratorian. His English was pure and perfect, equally in writing and in speaking. And it had always the stillness of maturity. In such books as "*The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost*," or "*The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*," we are pleased with a quiet sincerity and a masterly knowledge, though seldom surprised by inventiveness or brilliancy. It has been said of the Cardinal that he controlled himself so thoroughly that he even suppressed his own power, his superiority; and certainly they who were his friends would always allow that self-control was his dominant characteristic through life. In writing a book, he seemed to set before him a duty, and no other object than duty was allowed to plead with him. In his "*True Story of the Vatican Council*," this sense of duty speaks from the pages, so that the reader feels that the whole story must be true, not so much because all false reports are refuted, as because the writer impresses his truthfulness irresistibly. Take, again, that masterly little book, "*The Grounds of Faith*." There is a quietness about it which is the quietness of calm assurance, every sentence "going home" to the reader's conscience as though it were the counsel of an earnest soul to his inmost friend. The pithiness, too, of the summing up of any controversy is often so neat as to be striking; it reminds us not unfrequently of Cardinal Newman. For example, he is speaking of the Anglican "*Branch Theory*," and he says: "These three bodies, so united in unwilling espousals, divorce each other. The Greek will not accept the Anglican with his mutilation of sacraments; nor will the Anglican accept the Greek with his practice of innovation. Neither does the Holy See accept either with their heresy and their schism. These three bodies, brought by theory into unwilling combination, refuse, in fact, to be combined. They can be united only upon paper." And the same neatness—very frequently quite epigrammatic—is found in everything that the Cardinal puts his hand to. No to speak of any of his Pastoral, —all admirable as compositions,—take his "*Four Great Evils of the Day*," his "*Fourfold Sovereignty of God*," his "*Cæsarism and Ultramontanism*," his "*Eternal Priesthood*," these productions all bear the same marked characteristics,—pithiness, perfect conviction, sense of duty. And when he wrote, as he frequently did, in periodicals, responding to many of the false cries of modern thought, the impression was, "the writer knows he is in the right, and only writes because he knows it."

As to the Cardinal's preaching, opinions differed. That he was perfectly easy, perfectly scholarly, all allowed; yet some people would have liked less self-suppression. He seemed to think that all emotionalism was out of place. He would talk as quietly from the sanctuary as he would talk with friends, shunning rhetoric, artifice, warm effect, just as in his books or in his published letters he was quite natural. Hence, many persons would not allow that he was a great preacher. Yet the one conviction of all who heard him was, "that is true"; the one resolve of all who listened was, "I will do it." So that since he persuaded—which is the sovereign test of all true oratory—he must have been a good preacher, if not a great one. They who have listened to some of the select preachers at Nôtre Dame, in Paris, or to the glorious earnestness of other impassioned preachers in the south, will perhaps allow that they were more captivated by the brilliancy than they were braced up to newness by the truth. Now, Cardinal Manning had little method, little style. What pleaded with you when he was preaching, so far as "the man" was allowed to plead, was his most picturesque asceticism, his holy look.

And one trait which was in perfect keeping with such characteristics was his immense charity, in believing the best of all non-Catholics. He would say of his Protestant countrymen, "They are not heretics, they are in heresy." Only a few weeks before he died, he published a letter, which, unhappily, was not quite taken as it was meant. He wrote that all good and sincere Protestants must be charitably hoped to belong to the spiritual body of the Church; a hope which was, at once, magnanimous and well grounded, but which left immense margin to the interpretation of "sincerity." Yet, here we had the gentle spirit of this saintly man. In his old age he seemed to lose every other feeling than the tranquil desire to believe and to do kindly. Ripe with the ripeness of eighty-four years; worn out by having worked hard for others' good; looking forward to the eternal home above where shall be no rancor, no false judgment; the last years of the good Cardinal were like the maturity of Christian virtues, from which all soil, dross, or earthliness had dropped away.

In private life there was always that grave playfulness which made him singularly winning and even fascinating. His keen sense of humor was subjected to the same mastership which ruled absolutely every action and every word; yet he had a quiet way of giving gentle monitions which, though it never offended, left its mark. Thus, to a Cambridge undergraduate, who told him that he had the intention of taking Holy Orders, he replied, "Be sure that you get them, my son." To a young lady of nineteen, who promised him to become a Catholic so soon as she should attain the age of

twenty-one, he replied, "Can you promise me that you will live till you are twenty-one?" His quiet and exact way of pointing a retort, enlivened only by a gentle humor, which was like light, made even his monitions to be fascinating, while it made his exhortations inspiring. And at this point it may be mentioned—since we are speaking chiefly of his private career—that his private charities were quite as princely as his public services, his private kindnesses as superlative as was his philanthropy. No wonder that he left so little behind him. It seemed incredible that out of his really narrow resources he could positively never send a poor pleader away from him without a help, which was as substantial in character as it was graceful in the manner of its imparting.

Nor will it be idle to mention here that he was fondly interested in children, and was a constant helper of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty. It was through the Cardinal that the Queen became patron of this society. Mr. Stead, the well known Protestant journalist, recently wrote: "Many have been the speculations as to the figure which the Cardinal will make in history. Some have pictured him as the tribune of the poor, others as an incipient Hildebrand, others as a nineteenth-century Loyola; but, I prefer to think of him as the loving-hearted old man who, when his heart is filled with ecstasy after a meditation on the life and love of our Lord, feels impelled to go forth among the crowds of children playing in the London parks, and to silently bless them in the name of Him who said, 'Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not.'"

III.

Let us take up Mr. Stead's words, in conclusion, and ask, "What will be the figure which the Cardinal will make in history?"

Now the Irish, with one accord, will claim for the Cardinal the historic figure of the most generous of the English champions of Irish liberties. In the words of the resolution of the Irish Parliamentary party, assembled in London on the 18th of January: "His memory will be cherished by the people of Ireland, with reverence and love, for his earnest and persevering efforts to obtain the application of the golden rule of Christian conduct to the treatment of their national claims for justice." It is perfectly true that the Cardinal took no public or professed part in the political struggle for the restoration of Irish liberties, but he never lost an opportunity of letting the whole world know his sentiments on the vexed question which is summed up in Home Rule. In the words of his letter addressed to Mr. Munich, now a little more than seven years ago, he "always held himself to be officially bound to neutrality on party questions; but the restoration of Ireland's legisla-

tive rights he regarded as a matter of national restitution, and altogether beyond partisan considerations." And this attitude of bold, unflinching advocacy of Ireland's rights—maintained both in public and in private—was all the more chivalrous in the face of the painful fact that the majority of Catholic aristocrats were anti-Irish. This majority also set the bad fashion for the Catholic middle classes who talk of Ireland as if it were some barbarous country which had never possessed Christian liberties; whereas, they should know that Ireland preceded England by a long era of civilization, and owes all the evils of her modern history to English barbarism. Now, the Irish in England keenly appreciated the warm advocacy of the English-born champion of their rights. And there was, too, a deeper than a political feeling in the tenderness of their appreciation of this sympathy. They knew that English Catholics owed their enjoyment of religious liberty very largely to the superb fidelity of the Irish—they knew, moreover, that a fearful debt was owed to Irishmen by Englishmen for the satanic cruelties with which English government had tortured them; and they knew how *they*, the Irish, would have leaped at reparation had the national interest been historically reversed. This strange ingratitude or insensibility, on the part of many English Catholics, caused terrible sadness of soul to their Irish neighbors; and therefore was it, that they gave to Cardinal Manning the full swing of their souls' tender thankfulness; and therefore, also, will Irish historians in days to come give to Cardinal Manning the historic figure of Ireland's Friend—the friend of the Irish people, of their religion, of their rights.

But what figure will English historians give to Cardinal Manning, in regard to his relations to English society? Undoubtedly, as was said at the beginning of this article, the weakening of the social prejudice against the status of Catholics,—their religious, political, and social status,—has been the most conspicuous of the triumphs of the late Cardinal; so that his historical figure will probably be that of the Englishman who killed prejudice, more than any Englishman since the Reformation. Take one really eloquent illustration: For many years it has been a habit of members of the royal family to assist at Catholic celebrations in Catholic churches. At the Cardinal's Requiem representatives of the royal family were present officially and demonstratively; they assisted at Mass; they showed by their reverent manner that they profoundly honored the Cardinal's religion, even more profoundly than they venerated his memory. We may say, therefore, that the official recognition of Catholicity, as a faith which has equal claims with the Church-of-Englandism, is a perfectly new feature in the last twenty years. And may it be added (for this is conso-

nant with our inquiry), that the new Anglican custom of holding memorial services, for those who die outside the pale of the Catholic Church, is a tribute to the reasonable justice and blessed charity of the Catholic custom of saying prayers for the dead. It is a very close approach to Catholic sentiment, though hitherto it has stopped short of Catholic doctrine. Yet the doctrine is profoundly honored by the sentiment. Indeed, these memorial services, of which Queen Victoria is the grand patron, was a touchingly beautiful tribute to the Catholic faith; they show how natural is the instinct of the communion between two worlds, and they promise an easy transition to the whole truth. Now the future historian or essayist, when he comes to speak of Cardinal Manning, will have to say that the tone and temper of religious thought was rationally affected by the close proximity of the Catholic faith. We can imagine an historian writing fifty years hence: "In those days there was a Protestant craving for something better. Even the excesses of the Ritualists showed the longing for a something wanting; while the assumption of a mild pontificate by Archbishop Benson proved the instinct of the necessity for a sovereign rule." And then we can imagine the historian adding: "the frightful inroads of impious freethinking in Protestant England were alarming to all good Protestants as to what was to come; while at the same time these good Protestants watched the resistance of the Catholic Church to the rush of the wild waters of unbelief." And just at this point—to anticipate the climax of our future essayist—we can imagine him thus warming in his eulogy: "Cardinal Manning was the typical figure of that moral force which all England saw could alone resist freethinking; in his person was seen the figure of Catholic resistance; his was associated in the English mind with the idea, authority; he was regarded even as alone embodying the positive, while all around him seemed to be negative or at least speculative; and so he was looked upon as a true friend to the country, and when he died, he was mourned as an apostle."

Finally, what do the English working classes say of the Cardinal; what "figure" do they prophesy for him in history? Irish, English, and Italian workers in the great towns all testify that "in the death of the Cardinal they have lost their best friend and advocate." All remember especially how, during the great Dock strike, when scores of thousands of London workmen were in danger of starving, the Cardinal met the united strike committees at an appointed place, and pleaded so earnestly with them, point by point, through all their difficulties, that his counsel put an end to the terrible crisis. All remember too his wonderful letters on the Social Question, on the Poor Jews, on the Temperance Ques-

tion, on Religious Music, on the Problem of the Unemployed, on millions of our brothers who groan under the yoke of Excessive Labor, on the Right to Work for Food, on the Eight Hour Day, on Want in Winter, on the Omnibus Men, on Homes for the Working Boys and Clubs for the Working Girls, on the London Music Halls, on My Old and Tried Sympathy with Ireland—of which near country he said in a public oration, when he was pleading for English justice to the Irish: "A narrow channel only divides us from a people who speak the same tongue, who are of the same family with us, who are our fellow countrymen, who are our brothers." And, finally, all remember the splendid stand which he made, by almost innumerable letters and pamphlets, for the right of poor Catholic parents to have their children educated in the faith which was to them more than home, more than life; and, as a consequence, all now know the fact, that the School Boards of England no longer ignore Christianity, while there is not so much as one Metropolitan Union which does not send its Catholic children to Catholic teachers.

The special point then of all these pleadings,—what we may call their doctrine of social philosophy,—was that all classes had the same right to religious justice, and all classes had the same right to temporal benefits; that the workman was fully as honorable as his employer, had the same claim on our respect and consideration, was as much a member, in a Catholic sense, of the family of God, as the sovereign, the noble, the capitalist. We know, indeed, that this is a Catholic truism, but it is a truism which had been long ignored in English society. Cardinal Manning brought it to life and gave it power. He may be said even to have made it a grand political axiom. Whereas, when he was consecrated Archbishop of Westminster, the English workman had few rights, had only concessions, he has now,—to quote the words of the late Cardinal, published a few years ago to all England—"fully as honorable a position as his employer, and his rights are equally sacred and inviolable."

"The Workman's Friend" is therefore that figure in English history which the English workman can safely prophesy for his greatest benefactor; and if he could inscribe an epitaph over his grave, he might aptly use the Divine words, so often heard from the good Cardinal, "I have compassion on the multitude."

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

CATHOLIC ASTRONOMERS.

ON the 7th of December, 1889, H. M. S. *Comus* reached the Iles de Salût, near Cayenne, having on board Rev. Stephen Joseph Perry, S. J., who had come to observe the solar eclipse of December 22, 1889. Owing to the poor sanitary arrangements of the island, rain causes an effluvium to rise from the soil, which is almost insupportable to visitors. During the days preceding the eclipse there was heavy rain, and Father Perry, already weakened from severe sea-sickness during the voyage from Barbados, was attacked by fever.

On the morning of the 22d the temporary observatory, in which all the necessary preparations for the successful observation of the eclipse had been made, presents a picture which will ever be associated with this eclipse. All the instruments are prepared and adjusted, and each observer is at his post when the director, Father Perry, attacked by a fatal fever, weak and suffering, enters, leaning on the arm of a blue-jacket. He comes to take his last observation, to perform the task which, in recognition of his merits, the Solar Eclipse Committee of the Royal Astronomical Society, has imposed upon him, to pay his last tribute of love to the science he loved so well, to die a martyr of science. A kind Providence will crown this his last work with success. Although a heavy rain fell shortly before the eclipse, still at the critical moment the sky brightened and the half-eclipsed sun appeared in a large patch of blue sky. The programme drawn up was faithfully carried out, and when the observations were finished, Father Perry was able to say: "This is the most successful observation of the kind that I have ever had anything to do with."

The affecting story of the few remaining days of his life has been often told. The painful journey from the camp back to his quarters at the Military Hospital, the devout reception of the last sacraments on board the *Comus* before they set sail, the dictation from his death-bed of the telegram which announced at Greenwich the results of his work, the resignation, the peaceful and holy death at sea, about seventy miles from Demerara, are all well known and part of the history of this eclipse.

Father Perry's chief work was done as director of the Stonyhurst observatory. It was in the line of terrestrial magnetism and solar physics. His papers on these subjects are valuable contributions to science. As a lecturer on astronomical subjects he was

especially successful. His great care in preparation, accurate and enthusiastic exposition, and power of adapting himself to his audience, made him popular, as the long list of places in which he lectured shows. He lectured at the Royal Institution before the Société Scientifique of Brussels, and the Catholic Scientific Congress at Paris, at Dublin, Cambridge, Montreal, South Kensington, Manchester, Wigan, Lancaster, Preston, Burnley, Glasgow, Blackpool, Skipton, Oldham, Bolton, Chester, Southampton, Birmingham, Bombay, Barbados and Georgetown, Demerara. He also lectured on board the vessels which conveyed him on his many astronomical expeditions, and everywhere met with the greatest success; and equally painstaking, whether he spoke to the small boys at Hodder, to the workingmen of Lancashire, or to the cultured audience at the Royal Institution. Besides his work in the class-room at Stonyhurst, his labor in the observatory and his numerous courses of lectures just enumerated, he found time to take part in several scientific expeditions. In fact, at the time of the last, it was said that he was a member of more scientific expeditions than any living astronomer. His first was in 1870, to Spain, to observe a solar eclipse, when he had charge of the station at Cadiz. In 1874, Sir G. B. Airy, then royal astronomer, appointed him to take command of the expedition to Kerguelen or Desolation Island in the South Pacific to observe the transit of Venus. The success with which he conducted his work on this journey and in the midst of great difficulties, caused him to be selected to lead another party in 1882 to Nos Vey, Madagascar, to observe the second transit of Venus of this century. In August, 1886, he was at Carriacou in the West Indies, and in August, 1887, he was in Russia, on both occasions on solar eclipse expeditions. To these must be added his last journey to Salût. Father Perry was enthusiastic in his astronomical work, but his enthusiasm was well regulated, and never interfered with thoroughness and patient accuracy. Hence, his published results can be trusted as deductions from a long and careful series of observations. Many of his principal papers on scientific subjects are to be found in the "Monthly Notices" of the Royal Astronomical Society, others in "The Month," "Nature," "Tablet," "Observatory," "Copernicus," "British Journal of Photography," "Astronomical Register," and "Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles," etc.

In a life so full of labor in the cause of science, and at the same time so remarkable for the faithful and loving discharge of the duties of his sacred calling as a priest and religious of the Society of Jesus, we have a strong argument that faith has nothing to fear from science and a refutation of the old calumny that the Church is opposed to science. In his life, science has been adorned by

labors carried on in the spirit of the Church, so well expressed in the fourth chapter of the constitution "*Dei Filius*:" "The Catholic Church with one consent has ever held and does hold that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct both in principle and also in object: in principle, because our knowledge in the one is by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith; in object, because besides those things to which natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known. . . . But, although faith is above reason, there can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and God cannot deny Himself, nor truth ever contradict truth. . . . And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to the other; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine; while faith frees and guards reason from errors and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they come from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method; but recognizing this just liberty, it stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of faith."

With such a plain statement of the position which the Church has ever held, and will ever continue to hold, with regard to science, it is almost incredible that men should find a theme in what they are pleased to call the conflict of the Church and science, and should almost continually portray, in glowing terms, what they are pleased to imagine is the fear and consternation of the Church at the sight of the prodigious development of modern science.

It is in this spirit that Huxley writes in his "*Lay Sermons*:" "Our great antagonist—I speak as a man of science—the Roman Catholic Church, the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and must, as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization, manages her affairs much better." It is in the same strain that Tyndall writes in his article on "*Martineau and Materialism*." He says, speaking of Catholics: "Their spiritual guides live so exclusively in the pre-scientific past that even the really strong intellects among them are reduced to

atrophy as regards scientific truth. Eyes they have, and see not; ears they have, and hear not; for both eyes and ears are taken possession of by the sights and sounds of another age. In relation to science, the ultramontane brain, through lack of exercise, is virtually the undeveloped brain of the child."

That such statements are wide of the truth is clear, if we but recall the work of Father Perry. So far, indeed, is the Church from opposing science, that it was under her protection, and with her encouragement, and even with the pecuniary aid of her Pontiffs that some of the most remarkable scientists of modern times were enabled to carry on the investigations which have immortalized their names and enhanced the treasures of science.

There may be an apparent strife between science and religion; but this is due to the illogical method of drawing certain conclusions from hypothetical premises; a method, alas! too prevalent among a certain class of writers. They take the guess, or the trial hypothesis, of some investigator, and treat it as a fully-established truth from which they draw the most sweeping conclusions. A specimen will show what we mean. Professor Huxley writes, in the "Nineteenth Century," "You are quite mistaken in supposing that anybody, who is acquainted with the possibilities of physical science, will undertake to categorically deny that water may be turned into wine. Many very competent judges are already inclined to think that the bodies, which we have hitherto called elementary, are really composite arrangements of the particles of a uniform primitive matter. Supposing that view to be correct, there would be no more theoretical difficulty about turning water into alcohol, ethereal and coloring matters, than there is at this present moment any practical difficulty in working other such miracles; as, when we turn sugar into alcohol, carbonic acid, glycerine, and succinic acid; or, transmute gas-refuse into perfumes rarer than musk, and dyes richer than Tyrian purple." Mr. Lockyer has proposed an unestablished theory of the dissociation of the elements to explain solar phenomena, and therefore, according to Mr. Huxley, our Lord did not perform a miracle at the marriage feast. The conclusion is not warranted by the premise, and, even if the premise were an established truth, the conclusion is too sweeping. For our divine Lord spoke but the word and the miraculous change took place. Mr. Huxley might easily make a fortune if he could perform what he calls "other such miracles," "transmute gas-refuse into perfumes rarer than musk, and dyes richer than Tyrian purple," by simply talking at the contents of his retorts.

Our object, however, at present, is not so much to point out the illogical methods of reasoning adopted by the opponents of

the Church, as to show that the history of science is a perpetual refutation of the hue-and-cry which they have set up of the opposition of the Church to science. The long list of her faithful sons who are honored for their labor in every branch of science, is a forcible rebuke to those who have eyes to see and will not see, ears to hear and will not hear.

The task would be an unending one, did we undertake to give but the briefest sketch of Catholics eminent in all departments of science. So we will confine ourselves to those who have illustrated the science of astronomy; and here we are constrained to mention only some of the more prominent, merely to show that history proves our point.

Here, two errors must be guarded against. We do not claim that, because they were Catholics they were great astronomers, but simply point out the fact that their Catholicity did not forbid or impede them in their scientific studies; secondly, we do not wish to be understood as praising them to the disparagement of those distinguished astronomers who did not share their faith, but whose names are inseparably linked with the greatest achievements of the science of the heavens. To extol the genius of Galileo is not to detract from that of Newton; to praise Copernicus is not to disparage Kepler. Far be it from us to disparage the work of Kepler, when our brothers in religion, the Jesuits of Gratz, gave him their protection and a safe asylum when he fled for his life from Protestant Tübingen. It would, indeed, be invidious to select any class of these able scientists and praise their labors to the disparagement of the others, who are entitled to at least an equal share in the honor of developing astronomy to its present perfect condition. Still, we may be pardoned if, for a special object, we select some among them, and show that they made their impress on the science of astronomy, and wrote their names indelibly in its history.

There have been numerous devotees of science, of all shades of belief, who have devoted themselves to science for the sake of science, and who have not sought to invade with imperfect equipment the domain of theology. In no science, perhaps, can this be said with as equal truth as in astronomy. All honor to these workers in their proper sphere, and we hail every new fact discovered, every new law elaborated, and every new confirmation of existing theories, giving to each its due weight, and to each discoverer the glory of his work.

It is without offence to these that we select a few Catholic astronomers, and point out their share in the development of the science, in order to add a refutation to those who still affirm that Catholics shun the scientific field on account of what they are pleased to call the conflict of science and religion. They claim

that science threatens the foundations of Christianity, and hence Catholics shun it. The calumny, we know, is threadbare, but still, every now and then, it is brushed up like second-hand stock and exhibited in the hope that appearances may deceive.

The first period in astronomy was, as in all science, one of observation. The time of return of the heavenly bodies was carefully calculated, and their places in space determined. This was the work of the Chinese and Chaldeans, to which the Greeks added a complex geometrical plan of cycles and epicycles in explanation of these motions. Thus was the way prepared for the simple and harmonious system of Copernicus. This discoverer of the true mechanism of the heavens was born on the 19th of February, 1473, at Thorn, in West Prussia. Educated at the University of Cracow, at the age of 25 he went to Rome to perfect himself in astronomy, and became the pupil of Regiomontanus, who was, at that time, the most celebrated astronomer of the world. He received Holy Orders while in Rome, and, on returning to his own country, was made Canon of the Church of Frauenburg. Forty years of labor in the garret of a farm-house, with instruments of the rudest workmanship, without the telescope, and without the knowledge of the law of gravitation, was crowned by the establishment of his grand hypothesis. Late in life though, and at the instigation of Cardinal Schomberg, he published his great work, "*De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium*," which he dedicated to Pope Paul III. According to the old system, the earth was the immovable centre of the heavens, and around this centre the heavens revolved once in twenty-four hours. To account for the retrograde motion of the planets, this system was encumbered with the complicated machinery of cycles and epicycles. The planets moved in circles around assumed centres, which were themselves moving in circular orbits around the Earth. Such complexity was, in the mind of Copernicus, inconsistent with the simplicity and grandeur which he saw in the works of the Creator. The theory he proposed was, fundamentally, first, that the Earth makes a complete revolution on its axis once in twenty-four hours, thus occasioning the apparent diurnal revolution of the heavens; and, secondly, that the Sun and not the Earth is the centre around which the earth and all the other planets revolve. His determination of the relative distances of the planets from the sun differs but little from that made by more approved methods. Considering the primitive means of observation at his disposal, it is remarkable to find such accuracy in his results.

He divided his day into three parts; the first he devoted to the duties of his sacred calling; the second, to the care of the poor; and the third to scientific study. He loved science, but did

not neglect his sacred office. And to this Catholic priest we owe the foundation on which succeeding generations have reared the grand structure of modern astronomy.

Thus closed the first era of astronomical development; the second, or theoretical, was begotten of the spirit of inquiry which was gradually developing, and seeking the causes of the numerous facts collected during the preceding or observational era. The second period began with the annunciation of the theory of universal gravitation. On its threshold we meet Galileo. "What were the laws made use of by Newton," asks Herbert Spencer, "in working out his grand discovery? The law of falling bodies, disclosed by Galileo; that of the composition of forces, also disclosed by Galileo; and that of centrifugal force, found out by Huyghens—all of them generalizations of terrestrial physics." Thus Galileo claims a share in the establishment of universal gravitation, which began the second great period of development in astronomy, and which is marked by elaborate calculus that unravels the intricate consequences of a single simple law. Some claim Galileo as the inventor of the telescope, but, though this claim does not seem well-founded, still, it is certain that he made his own, and was the first to direct a telescope towards the heavens. He first saw the moon, with her mountains and valleys; Jupiter with his four satellites; Saturn, with his rings; Venus, with her moonlike phases; the milky-way, as a galaxy of fixed stars; and that the planets shone not with their own but with reflected light. These discoveries, by means of the telescope, have been so admired by the public that they have lost sight of his work in other fields which, perhaps, form the crowning merit of Galileo.

That Galileo lived and died a sincere Catholic is certain. His manner of upholding his observations brought him into trouble with the Roman tribunals, but his doctrine was never condemned as heretical, as the authors and propagators of a now threadbare calumny would have us believe. Whewell, in his "*Inductive Sciences*," speaking of the memoirs "*Galileo e l'Inquisizione*," by Mgr. Marino Marini, says "In these he confirms the conclusion which, I think, almost all persons who have studied the facts have arrived at, that Galileo trifled with authority to which he professed to submit, and was punished for obstinate contumacy, not for heresy." In a note, Whewell adds that Marini mentions Leibnitz, Guizot, Spittler, Eichorn, Raumer, Ranke among those who have at last done justice to the Church, hence there is no need of our entering upon this trite discussion. Suffice it to say Galileo died a sincere Catholic.

At the dawn of this second period we find Jean Picard, a French ecclesiastic, who was one of the original members and the first

president of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. His greatest service for astronomy was to make the first accurate measurement of a degree of the meridian. It was the measure of Picard that enabled Newton to establish the great principle of universal gravitation. He was the first to draw the attention of astronomers to the phenomena of nutation and aberration.

Throughout this period the names of Catholic astronomers are found in every department of the science. The first to bring the erratic comet within the reach of science was the Abbot Gassendi. He was also the first to observe the transit of a planet across the disc of the sun by projecting an image of the sun on a screen in a dark room, and thus noting the beginning and end of transit. In the study of comets, Father De Vico, S. J., is justly celebrated. He calculated the time of return of Halley's comet, and was the first to see it on August 5, 1835. He was the discoverer of eight comets.

The first great standard catalogue of stars was prepared by Piazzi, a Theatine monk, and this catalogue of 7646 stars has been the basis of all star catalogues since published. He corrected the parallaxes of some of the heavenly bodies, and the obliquity of the ecliptic. His untiring industry was shown in the systematic labor which resulted in the discovery of Ceres, the first known of the asteroids. He undertook to examine all the stars in a belt of the heavens bordering on the ecliptic. He examined them in groups of fifty, each group being subjected to four successive examinations before proceeding to the next. The thirteenth star in the 159th group was found to be a small planet or asteroid.

Among our Catholic astronomers we have Domenico Cassini, who calculated the periods of rotation of the sun, Venus, Mars, and Jupiter. He published very accurate tables of the sun in 1656. He also discovered the first, second, third and fifth satellites of Saturn. He was regarded as the most renowned astronomer of his day.

This list might be increased by the names of Miraldi, Castelli and Bianchini, and others who did efficient work in this their chosen field. Nor can we omit a reference to that grand and useful work, the revision of the calendar, for which we are indebted to Pope Gregory XIII., with whose name are associated those of Clavius, Chacon and Danti, to whom the Pope entrusted the work.

The sixteenth century was remarkable for the change that occurred in the spirit of progress. The studios of the sculptor and painter were deserted for the lecture-room of the scientist, and, as Libri remarks, the death of Michael Angelo and the birth of Galileo occurring on the same day, might be taken as a parable of the age. At first, science was studied in the proper spirit, but gradually there

grew up among some scientists a spirit of skepticism and materialism. To counteract this evil tendency, the Society of Jesus, in its schools, paid special attention to the study of science. Although the work of its members was not confined to any special branch, still they seem to have shown a special predilection for astronomy, and the great number of its members who devoted themselves to this study swells the list of Catholic astronomers. We quote from M. l'Abbe Maynard, "The Jesuits: their Studies and their Teaching."

"In Germany and the neighboring countries there were few Jesuit colleges without an observatory. They were found at Ingolstadt, Gratz, Breslau, Olmutz, Prague, Posen, etc. Most of them seem to have shared the fate of the society, though there are a few, as that of Prague, which survive the general destruction. The observatory of Prague, built in 1749, was, for a long time, under the care of Father Stepling, to whom the university principally owes the introduction of the exact sciences in her course of studies. In their magnificent college at Lyons, the Jesuits possessed an observatory most eligibly situated, which had been erected by Father de Saint-Bonnet. To him succeeded Father Rabuel, the erudite commentator on the geometry of Descartes; Duclos; and, finally, Father Béraud, an ingenious philosopher, an excellent geometer, a zealous and laborious observer. 'It affords me sincere pleasure,' continues Montucla, 'to cast some flowers of remembrance on the tomb of this worthy and learned Jesuit. He it was who initiated me in the science, and the same service was performed by him for citizens Bossut and Lalande.' To the Jesuits we owe the multiplication of observatories in various parts of Europe. Hitherto, they were scarcely to be found in the capitals; but the Jesuits spared neither pains nor expense to erect in every considerable college a building consecrated to astronomy. Thus, Father Huberti superintended the building of an observatory at Würzburg; Father Hell, at Vienna. At Manheim a third was founded by Charles Theodore, Elector of Bavaria, at the instance of Mayer and Metzger, and under their direction. Like establishments were erected at Tyrman, by Keri; at Prague, by Stepling, as Montucla has just informed us; at Gratz, by the Jesuits of the college; at Wilna, by Lebrowski and Poczubut; at Milan, by Palavicini, after the designs of Boscovich, and at the expense of the society; at Florence, by Ximénès; at Parma, by Belgrado; at Venice, by Panigai; at Brescia, by Cavalli; at Rome, by Asclepi; at Lisbon, by Carboni and Copasse; at Marseilles, by Laval and Pezenas; and by Bonfa, at Avignon."

In the history of theoretical astronomy one of the most remarkable achievements of this branch must be accredited to the Catholic Leverrier. Arago proposed the task to Leverrier, then a

young astronomer who had distinguished himself by constructing a new set of tables from which the places of Mercury might be predicted with greater precision than by older tables. This was put to the test during the transit of Mercury on the 8th of May, 1845; and it was found that while the old tables were out fully one minute and a half, those of Leverrier were in error only by about sixteen seconds as a mean. The success of this investigation encouraged him to undertake the task proposed by Arago of solving the problem presented in the perturbations of Uranus. After the discovery of this planet, astronomers soon determined an orbit for it. It was found, however, that this planet did not follow this orbit, even after the orbit had been corrected in the light of new and repeated observations. Various suppositions had been made to explain the erratic conduct of Uranus when Leverrier attacked the problem. He determined to rely solely on his own efforts; he rejected all that had been done, and commenced the problem at the very beginning. New analytic theories were formed, elaborate investigations of Jupiter and Saturn as disturbing bodies were made, and all possible causes of disturbance in the known bodies of the system were carefully weighed, and the indefatigable mathematician could say, here are residual perturbations which cannot be accounted for by any known existing body; the explanation must be sought beyond Uranus. On June 1, 1846, he read before the Royal Academy of Sciences in Paris a memoir in which he proved that the perturbations of Uranus could be explained only by admitting the existence of a new planet exterior to Uranus. He set himself to work to calculate the position and mass of this unknown planet. It is impossible to convey in popular form an idea of the profound reasoning required for this investigation. Uranus was displaced by an amount only about equal to four times the apparent diameter of Jupiter as seen with the naked eye. No eye, however keen and piercing, without telescopic aid could ever have detected it. Yet Leverrier felt space for the cause of this disturbance, and so successfully, that on August 31, 1846, he was able to announce to the world the figure of the orbit, its distance, period of revolution, and even the mass of matter it contains. On the 18th of September, 1846, Leverrier requested his friend, Galle, of Berlin, to direct his telescope to that point of the heavens where his computations placed the new planet, and lo! it was actually found on the very first night the telescope was directed to it, within less than one degree of the place assigned it by Leverrier's computations. Thus was accomplished the most remarkable and boldest theorizing that has ever marked the career of astronomical science. Leverrier loved his science well, but his religion more.

Thus the *Univers*, in his obituary, says: "Far from concealing

his Catholic faith, he loved to confess it; a faith, whose demonstration and confirmation he beheld in the sublime science to which he had devoted his life. . . . For him, faith and science mutually enlightened each other. Therefore it was that his great mind never failed to bear testimony to the truth, protesting with all the authority which genius commands against the materialism of the age. After having asked for and received the last helps of religion, M. Leverrier gave up his soul to God."

While the scientific glory of Leverrier was in its zenith, that of Father P. A. Secchi, S. J., was rising above the horizon. "To Father Secchi is due the merit of having executed the first spectroscopic survey of the heavens. About 4000 stars were all passed in review by him, and classified according to the varying qualities of their light. His provisional establishment of four types of stellar spectra has proved a genuine aid to knowledge, through the facilities afforded by it for the arrangement and comparison of rapidly accumulating facts."¹ He is justly regarded as one of the effective founders of stellar spectroscopy. In Houzeau's "*Vade Mecum*" we find that he wrote more scientific articles in a given time than any of his contemporaries. His work on the sun is well known, and is reckoned among the most valuable in that department of astronomy.

Father Secchi's work belongs more properly to the third period in the development of the science of astronomy. His is the period of physical astronomy. Its investigations aim at knowing the heavenly bodies physically, and it is daily reaching its end by the improvements in the telescope and by the aid of the spectroscope and the photographic plate. It is the astronomy of our day, and Catholics are to be found in great numbers among the laborers in this field. Many of the great observatories of the world count Catholics on their working staffs, while special departments of the science are worked out in exclusively Catholic observatories. There is the observatory in Rome under the direction of Father Ferrari, S. J., where excellent work is done in the line of solar observations. We have also in the Eternal City the observatory in charge of Fr. Dcnza, and which was endowed by the liberality of the Holy Father. Many consider Father Fenyi, S. J., of the Kallcsa observatory, the most prominent observer of solar protuberances. The work inaugurated at Stonyhurst by Father Perry is still pursued with great activity by Father W. Sidgreaves, S. J., as may be gathered from the contributions appearing from his pen and that of Rev. A. Cortie, S. J. Father Braun, S. J., the first director of the Haynald observatory, has contributed much to science, as those who know his work on "*Cosmogony*" can attest.

¹ *History of Astronomy*, Clerke, p. 412.

C. F. Pechüle, an observer of Copenhagen, well known by his numerous short papers on astronomical subjects; De Ball, director of the Kuffner observatory in Vienna, a frequent contributor to astronomical journals; and Plassman, in Westphalia, author of a work on variable stars and of a star atlas for amateurs, and one of the founders of the German Astronomical Society for amateurs, are all Catholics. A work lately published, containing valuable zone observations, recalls the fact that the author, Lamont, of Munich, died fortified by the sacraments of the Church. In Kremsmünster, and in Grignon, the Benedictines have observatories, in the former, Father Wagner, and in the latter, Father Lamey, both with able assistants, are doing important work for the advancement of science.

But why increase the list? These names, with the brief sketch of their work, is evidence of the present activity of Catholics in the astronomical field. But one word of recognition for those laboring in our midst. The Catholic university at Washington already proves that Catholics appreciate work in the scientific field, and can take effective means for the advancement of scientific investigation. Already a magnificent 9-inch equatorial has been secured and placed in the hands of the professor of astronomy, Rev. Father Searle, C. S. P. This alone is a sufficient guarantee that good work will be initiated and carried through, and that astronomy will be indebted to the Catholic University of America for new and further developments. Father Searle is already known to the astronomical world, having computed the orbits of several comets and discovered an asteroid.

The Georgetown observatory, under the direction of Rev. J. Hagen, S. J., has lately attracted the attention of the scientific world by solving "a problem that has puzzled astronomers for half a century"; the problem, namely, of how to do away with that greatest of all the errors of observation, known to astronomers as the "personal equation." The invention referred to by the "Natur und Offenbarung," from which the above quotation is taken, is the "photochronograph" of Rev. G. Fargis, S. J. It was described in the October (1891) number of this magazine. The German magazine mentioned above says of it: "The importance of the new apparatus, not only for determining time and longitude, as the memoir (the Georgetown publication describing the invention) very modestly hints, but for celestial photography in general, ought to have been more fully brought out. One need but recall the recent failure of the determination of longitude between London and Paris. The English and French observers first did their work at home by telegraph; then they exchanged places to do the whole work over again, for the sole purpose of getting rid of the exas-

perating "personal equation." In spite of all this, a mistake of half a second remained. All these observers agree that the great expense of time and money is wasted, and that the whole labor will have to be done over again. Nay, it is proposed that the observers shall not only exchange places in London and Paris, but carry with them their own instruments. Now, all this would become entirely unnecessary if the new apparatus (photochronograph) just described were inserted at each end of the electric telegraph, thus setting aside the observers altogether. Georgetown College is the oldest Catholic educational establishment in the United States, and has lately celebrated the centenary of its foundation. We congratulate Georgetown College on following in the footsteps of the once-famous Roman College Observatory. Had the celebrated Father Secchi published this memoir, it would indeed be numbered among his very best achievements. Father Hagen, the director of the observatory, is well known by his mathematical work published last year, and by several valuable contributions on "variable stars."

We have already run beyond our limit with this imperfect and somewhat irregular enumeration. It will, however, serve to point out some of the work that has been done by Catholic astronomers in the past, and be an index of their activity in the present. It will be evidence, that while cherishing their faith, they love the light of scientific truth, and seek it as they do that of the sun and stars which bears the message they interpret so well.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.



THE TWO KENRICKS.

A TASK of no ordinary weight and difficulty must be undertaken by the writer who is expected to summarize in a single article of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* a satisfactory dissertation on the lives and labors of two among the most illustrious prelates who have figured in the Church History of the United States. Yet such was the request made to and the obligation imposed on him by the editor, when the memorable celebration of Archbishop Kenrick's golden jubilee took place in St. Louis, towards the close of last year. It is almost needless to state, that as the title suggested furnishes a wide scope of subject matter and of treatment, the present attempt must prove to be a very imperfect record. Nevertheless, it may afford some partial information regarding those great pastors of souls, who have conducted their flocks into good pastures, and who have pointed the way to heaven by instruction and example. One of those venerable brothers long since has been called from earth to merit the rewards of eternal life, while the other still survives. As both were as closely united in ecclesiastical relations, as in brotherhood, so shall we endeavor to combine a few incidents of their lives, without further preliminary remarks.

In the southern part of the ancient city of Dublin there is a street, once held to have been highly fashionable, and, being in the neighborhood of the old Four Courts during the early period of the last century, it became the abode of several eminent lawyers. It bore then, as it does at the present time, the name of Chancery Lane. It is also in the immediate vicinity of Dublin Castle. When the magnificent new building, known as the Four Courts, had been erected on the northern bank of the River Liffy, a gradual migration of the lawyers was a natural result, and most of the fraternity took up their residence elsewhere, chiefly in the North Dublin streets and squares. A class of respectable merchants and manufacturers succeeded them towards the close of the last century; and even at the present time, those antique-looking houses, with fan-lights over their door-ways, furnish sufficient evidence of former home comforts and a peculiar conventional style. The house No. 16 was occupied by Thomas and Jane Kenrick, the parents of those illustrious brothers, in the early years of the present century; and in it was born the younger of the two, as the writer learned by inquiry from the Archbishop himself. That

house still stands, four stories in height, with a passage way in front.

Not having any authentic information regarding other members of the family, it must suffice to state, that Francis Patrick Kenrick was born in Dublin, on the 3d of December, 1797, and that in the schools of his native city he received an elegant classical and a sound Catholic education. His uncle was the Rev. Richard Kenrick, who became parish priest of St. Nicholas of Myra, and who was distinguished for his charities to the poor. That venerable man was universally loved and respected during life, and after death he was greatly lamented. He took an especial interest in training his youthful nephews to habits and practices of piety. Francis Patrick became a member of the Purgatorian Society for men, who frequently assembled on evenings to recite the office of the dead, as also on Sundays and Holy days to teach Christian Doctrine in the parish church to boys. When about to leave Dublin and continue his studies in Rome as an aspirant to the sacred ministry, he introduced his younger brother, destined to be the future Archbishop of St. Louis, to take his place in that pious confraternity, although then only nine years old. The duty thus imposed on him was well fulfilled, and at the present day, members of that Confraternity at St. Nicholas of Myra's Church, Francis Street, rejoice to have had two such distinguished and devout brothers on the rolls of their sodality, while they deem it a great honor and advantage to have such a record and such examples still to animate their zeal and inspire devotion.

Having evinced an early call to the service of the Church, and having made good progress in all his studies, at the age of eighteen Francis Patrick went to Rome, there to complete his course and to receive ecclesiastical training. He also felt a desire to embrace the religious state, and he spent two years in the house of the Lazarists. But he was destined to move in a different sphere, and the United States Foreign Missions were to derive special advantage from his exemplary character and varied qualifications.

Four years were passed in the College of the Propaganda, where he was distinguished as an indefatigable student, and as a profoundly learned philosopher, canonist and theologian. A regular observer of rule and discipline, he was also noted for his suavity of disposition and for his great piety. Already had he given indications of signal ability and remarkable scholarship; while even then his habit of writing and of taking notes for class exercises gave him facilities in the practice of composition, which enabled him in after life to utilize the knowledge acquired, for the instruction and benefit of so many other ecclesiastics.

He sailed to the United States in 1821, and on arriving there, set out for the distant State of Kentucky, in which the venerable Bishop Flaget ruled the See of Bardstown. There a theological seminary had been established, known as St. Joseph's College. The Rev. Mr. Kenrick was appointed one of its professors, while he attended likewise to the duties of St. Joseph's Church adjoining. In the college were eighteen ecclesiastical students preparing for holy orders, while ten seminarians, pursuing their theological course, acted as tutors or prefects over about two hundred pupils. He had been sent there especially from Rome, to train priests for the rising missions of the West.

On the accession of Pope Leo XII. to the pontifical throne, an indulgence in the form of a jubilee had been proclaimed, and Bishop Flaget convened the priests of his diocese for a spiritual retreat the first week of September, 1826. On the 10th of that month the jubilee was promulgated in his cathedral, and the exercises were begun. Afterwards, he proposed to visit each congregation in his diocese, attended by Rev. Mr. Kenrick, who gave a series of instructions and religious exercises.

When travelling was practicable he continued the work of his Divine Master, and at the close of a sermon in Springfield a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Mr. Sneed, attempted to reply to Father Kenrick's arguments; but the acute and accomplished theologian fully exposed his presumption and ignorance while demolishing his sophistries. The Protestants who were present listened with attention to that controversy; and while they were deeply impressed with the utter defeat of their advocate, it was an occasion of great rejoicing for the Catholics. During this season of grace, nearly all the faithful in Kentucky approached the sacraments, while in 21 congregations 1216 were confirmed and more than 6000 approached Holy Communion.

An impostor, representing himself to be a priest and bishop-elect of Illinois, had taken advantage of that religious revival, and sought to profit by it when, avoiding the route of the bishop and his missionaries, he preached in some parts of Kentucky and Illinois. Soon, however, his knavery was exposed, through the exertions of Rev. Francis P. Kenrick and another zealous priest, Rev. John Timon, afterwards first Bishop of Buffalo. During the progress of that celebrated mission, numbers of Catholics, formerly very indifferent to their Christian obligations, became afterwards practical and fervent. The missionaries toiled in season and out of season during the time, though often exposed to serious inconvenience and discomforts, owing to the difficulty of travelling over rough roads and of finding suitable lodgings.

Under the signature of Omega, a Rev. Dr. Blackburn had im-

pugned the Catholic doctrine regarding the Blessed Eucharist in that part of the country; and in 1828, under the signature of Omicron, a reply was published by Father Francis P. Kenrick, which fully established the truth of that dogma.

For nine years Father Kenrick remained at Bardstown, and during that time not only did he most sedulously attend to his duties as teacher at the seminary, but he engaged on a vast field of missionary labor throughout the scattered Catholic stations and settlements in that extensive diocese. He preached many sermons and expounded the doctrines of the Catholic Church so learnedly and yet so clearly to the members of various congregations that his fame went abroad, and numbers of Protestants flocked to hear him. Among these, on one occasion, was the celebrated Kentucky senator, Hon. Henry Clay.

For a long time the diocese of Philadelphia had been unhappily disturbed by schism, owing to the system of lay-trusteeism which then prevailed in the American Church. The aged bishop of that see, Rt. Rev. Henry Conwell, required an able assistant to relieve him from the complications and difficulties which so greatly oppressed him. Accordingly, the Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick's well-established reputation for piety, ability, and judgment caused his recommendation for that office to the Sovereign Pontiff, with powers for the administration of the diocese.

He was therefore appointed coadjutor to Rt. Rev. Bishop Conwell, with right of succession. When the latter heard of that appointment he set out for Kentucky, although oppressed with the weight of years and troubles, to assist at the consecration. This sacred function was discharged by the venerable Bishop Flaget, who was grieved to lose the services of his attached friend and companion; but in pursuance of the bulls received from Rome, the coming festival of the Holy Trinity was named for the ceremony. Accordingly, Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick was consecrated Bishop of Arath *in partibus infidelium*, on the 6th of June, 1830. The assisting prelates were the Rt. Rev. Bishop Conwell and Rt. Rev. John Baptist David. The Rt. Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston, and Rt. Rev. Dr. Fenwick, Bishop of Cincinnati, were also present on that occasion. Soon afterwards, accompanied by Rt. Rev. Dr. Conwell, the newly consecrated bishop, taking Pittsburgh on the way, set out for Philadelphia, and arrived there on the 7th of July. Meantime, in that city, the energetic and talented Rev. John Hughes, afterwards Archbishop of New York, very ably cared for the interests of religion.

On arriving there, and on becoming acquainted with the state of affairs, Bishop Kenrick assumed control as administrator of the diocese, and soon he was actively engaged on a visitation of the

more remote parts, where he dedicated churches and administered confirmation. In September he gave Holy Orders, in the old church of Conewago, to five candidates presented by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Bruté; but at Chambersburg he was prostrated by fever for a time. Hearing of the Bishop's illness, the Rev. John Hughes went to his relief. On the 14th of November, Dr. Kenrick proclaimed the Jubilee in St. Mary's Church, of which he assumed the pastoral charge, and so notified the trustees on the 27th of December following. This created not a little opposition on their part, for they had resolved on keeping up the claim of patronage, to nominate their pastor, and to regulate the allowance for his support. But they had now to deal with a prelate who, despite his unobtrusive and quiet deportment, had a force of character and resolution more than sufficient to cope with such obstacles. Bishop Kenrick addressed a circular to the pew-holders on the 12th of April, 1831, which announced to them that it would be his duty to interdict the church unless all opposition ceased, and the Catholic principle of ecclesiastical government should be unequivocally allowed. To this mandate the trustees issued an evasive answer, and far from being satisfactory. Whereupon, Bishop Kenrick ordered the cessation of all sacred functions in St. Mary's Church, or in the burial-ground attached to it, after 12 o'clock on the 16th of April, unless the trustees signed a distinct disclaimer of these usurped functions. This, at first, they declined to do; however, after some attempts at opposition, they submitted. On the 28th of May, St. Mary's Church was again opened, and thus a long succession of scandals happily ceased.

The circumstances of the time and situation caused the Bishop to resolve on building a church which should be absolutely free from trustee dictatorship; and, aided by the Rev. John Hughes, he was enabled to secure a suitable site. He laid the corner-stone of a church under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist, in May, 1831, and the work was prosecuted so actively by Rev. John Hughes that Bishop Conwell officiated at its solemn dedication in April, 1832. This same year, also, Dr. Kenrick held the first Philadelphia Synod. In it several most salutary statutes were enacted for the regulation of discipline throughout the diocese. He next turned his attention to the establishment of an ecclesiastical seminary, and aided by generous subscriptions, he was soon enabled to effect that cherished project in a building on Fourth Street. His brother, lately ordained a priest in the diocese of Dublin, was requested to undertake the duty of acting as director in the training of young levites to supply missionary voids in the diocese.

It is now expedient to introduce the subject of his younger

brother, Peter Richard, to the reader's notice. He was born in Dublin, in the house No. 16 Chancery Lane, on the 17th of August, 1806. There, likewise, he lived until about two years before he entered the College of Maynooth, where, as a student, he manifested those remarkable qualities of intellect and of heart that gave earnest of his future grand career.

His preliminary course of studies began and continued in his native parish, under the immediate direction of his venerable uncle, the Very Rev. Richard Kenrick. The nephew became an accomplished classical scholar, while, besides the knowledge of Greek and Latin acquired in school, he cultivated a taste for other languages. The first lessons of German he learned in Dublin were taught him by the celebrated and gifted poet, James Clarence Mangan; and, in after-life, the Archbishop often spoke about his former tutor, for whose genius he had a most unbounded admiration, and who was so gentle and amiable in disposition. Moreover, he felt compassion and consideration for a weakness of character which led that unfortunate young man to occasional fits of inebriety that served to cloud his latter years with despondency.

The vocation of Peter Richard being manifestly for the ecclesiastical state, he entered St. Patrick's College, Maynooth in 1827, and there he was particularly distinguished among the students of that great establishment. But he did not glory in that distinction. On the contrary, we have been assured by a former fellow-curate of his at Rathmines, the late very Rev. Nicholas Canon Roche, afterwards parish priest of St. Michael and St. John, Dublin, that he often heard it stated by contemporaneous class-fellows that while Peter Richard was universally admired and respected for character and talents by professors and students, he would ever modestly seek to conceal, rather than display, his superiority over others. Whenever he was called in class, he was recognized by all as having thoroughly mastered the subject on which he was examined, while in the most retiring and humble manner he disclaimed those praises which were so freely bestowed upon him.

Ordained by the Most Rev. Daniel Murray, then Ordinary of the Dublin diocese, on the 6th of March, 1832, the Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick at first served in the Archbishop's mensal parish and in the Cathedral, Marlborough Street. After a short term, he was appointed curate in Rathmines parish, a southern suburb of Dublin. Just two years before his ordination, the Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, who volunteered for the American missions, had been consecrated as the third prelate of Philadelphia, and now he was greatly anxious to receive assistance from a brother whose high character and talents had been already so well established.

The Rev. Peter Richard arrived in the United States towards

the close of the year 1833, and then took up his position in Philadelphia. There he had charge of the theological seminary as President, where he conducted the discipline and course of studies in such manner as to gain the respect and affections of teachers and students.

In several of the city parishes he preached learned and eloquent sermons, which always engaged the attention and admiration of his hearers, many Protestants being present; and even on these he often produced the most deep and salutary impressions.

A religious weekly periodical, the *Catholic Herald*, had been established in Philadelphia, and soon his profound theological and historical knowledge, with his practiced facility in literary composition, made it sufficiently manifest that the Very Rev. Peter Richard was possessed of journalistic ability which must render the paper most efficient should he assume its direction as editor. Accordingly, his ready pen was engaged to furnish the leading articles, and it is to be hoped that at some date not too distant, an effort shall be made to identify and rescue from oblivion at least many of those compositions which have more than ephemeral interest to recommend them.

In addition to his other responsibilities, the Rev. Peter Richard was appointed Rector of the Cathedral. He discharged the obligations of a pastor with that ease of manner and affability of disposition which so greatly characterized him; while he was ever at the post of duty with an exactness and a regularity noticed by all who had occasion to avail themselves of his priestly offices.

He also discharged the functions of vicar-general to the bishop, who ever found in him a diligent and faithful assistant, as also a wise and capable counsellor. The affectionate relations existing between both of these distinguished brothers was productive of most perfect harmony and unity of action.

From the very first year he assumed charge of the see to the very last year of his life, Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick never ceased to make the round of his churches and congregations for the purpose of administering confirmation, of dedicating churches, and of holding visitations. Thus, from personal inspection and observation, he had a most correct knowledge of the state in which the various missionary stations were, and he was all the better enabled to co-operate with the respective pastors in forwarding their interests and in effecting improvements. During the years 1832 and 1833, when Asiatic cholera spread its fearful ravages in Philadelphia, in conjunction with his clergy and religious, the bishop made every possible provision to stay its progress, while he exhorted the Catholics by prayer and works of penance to avert

the anger of God, and to prepare, by devoutly frequenting the sacraments for a sudden death.

The Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia had secured a residence for himself, where he had opened a small theological seminary, and there he planted that mustard-seed which, before many years had elapsed, grew into one much finer in point of size and situation, until it developed into the present magnificent collegiate establishment, so beautifully situated about five or six miles from the city. Each of these seminaries had been successively dedicated to St. Charles Borromeo. The two former have since merged into different religious institutions. In 1835 that seminary, of which the Rev. Peter R. Kenrick was superior, had ten seminarians. That same year, also, the bishop originated a Seminary Fund Society for its maintenance, and this produced most excellent results. The house accommodations soon proved wholly inadequate for the increasing number of students, and an unfinished building, with its plot, on Eighteenth and Race Streets, facing on Logan Square, was procured. For the new seminary a charter of incorporation was obtained, April 13, 1838.

Vast indeed was the extent of Philadelphia Diocese at this time, comprising not alone the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, but even New Jersey in part. The growth of churches, chapels, and missionary stations, with the increase of religious institutions, had now convinced Bishop Kenrick that it must prove absolutely impossible for him to supervise in detail the business affairs of that diocese, and to fulfil all the active duties of his position. On the 25th of July, 1835, he wrote to the Propaganda explaining the immense labor which had to be undergone, and strongly recommending the division of western Pennsylvania, with the erection of its see at Pittsburgh. He also stated that he was ready to assume the organization, in person, of the new diocese, while recommending the appointment of Rev. John Hughes as Bishop of Philadelphia. Although the Congregation De Propaganda Fide considered these representations, further action was deferred by the Pope until the assembling of the next Provincial Council. However, when it met in 1837 the bishop was doomed to disappointment; and it is almost incredible how he was able to sustain for many subsequent years the fatigues and burdens daily accumulating on him. He was aided by his brother Peter Richard, whom he appointed his Vicar-General.

The ministers and members of the Protestant Episcopal denomination in the United States were a numerous and an influential body at that time, as they are in the present day, and the vicar-general considered his labor would be well bestowed in the production of a book calculated to treat a subject of prime interest

and fraught with important relations to them, yet in a historical line of investigation and inquiry which should avoid the wrangle or bitterness of theological polemics. Accordingly, a very admirable and researchful work, "The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined," was the product of his pen, and in it that whole subject was most lucidly stated in a didactic manner, with proofs adduced from English and other historic writers for the facts related in the text, and inferences to be drawn from the weight of evidence, ably digested and arrayed in support of his positive and negative thesis. When this book first appeared, and at a time when religious controversy had been greatly in vogue, attention was at once drawn to the matter it contained and to the manner of its treatment, while it attracted very general notice among Protestants as well as Catholics. It even created serious doubts regarding their actual position in the minds of many highly educated and earnest persons of the Protestant Episcopal communion, not alone in the United States, but likewise in the British Islands. That first edition was eagerly sought for and soon exhausted. It evoked replies, also, not alone in the United States of America, but in Europe. However, it made no enemies for the author, but, on the contrary, it earned the respectful consideration of many members of the Episcopalian denomination, and even among their clergy he had many sincere friends. However, from the press in Baltimore a gentleman named Hugh Davey Evans issued a reply in 1844, entitled "Essays to Prove the Validity of Anglican Ordinations: in Answer to the Right Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, R. C. Bishop of St. Louis," by a layman.

Soon afterwards, in England, the Rev. John Fuller Russell, B.C.L., incumbent of St. James Church, Enfield, published a work, "Anglican Ordinations Valid—A Refutation of Certain Statements in the Second and Third Chapters of 'The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined,' by the Very Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, V. G." That treatise was issued from the London press in 1846.

His tender devotion to the ever Blessed and Immaculate Virgin urged him to compile and publish "The New Month of Mary; or, Reflections for each Day of the Month on the different Titles applied to the Holy Mother of God in the Litany of Loretto. Principally designed for the Month of May." It was published at Philadelphia in the year 1840. Reflections, examples, prayers and practices are orderly arranged for each day, with discriminating judgment, taste and religious feeling pervading the whole. Its publication served greatly to promote the May devotions. It passed through several editions, not only in America but in Europe, and it is still extensively used. A "History of the Holy House of

Loretto " was also published by him, and it contains matter of very curious interest. An investigation of past records and traditions, relating to that celebrated place of pilgrimage, throws light on a subject not sufficiently known, especially to English readers; while the research and historic lore of the writer are abundantly evidenced in every page of that remarkable little guide-book to the shrine.

But admirable as were the writings of the younger brother, those of Francis Patrick were still more important and voluminous.

With a just discrimination and ability which so greatly distinguished him, while the Most Rev. Ambrose Marechal, Archbishop of Baltimore, had discharged the previous duties of theological professor in St. Mary's seminary, he often regretted the want of a theological text-book suited to the actual requirements of the Church in the United States. Had time, means and opportunity been afforded, it seemed likely he would willingly have undertaken the task of publishing a theology dealing more especially with the variations of creed among the sects, with the modern themes of religious controversy, as also with the philosophical, moral, social and political condition of affairs in the great and growing republic. It was found, likewise, that among the most approved treatises then issued in Europe, no single writer could be mentioned who had forecast or grappled with the difficulty, or who had supplied the remedy. However, when consecrated and obliged to discharge the absorbing duties of his high station, no hope remained for accomplishing such a task; but he and other ecclesiastics urged it on Dr. Kenrick, whose learning and ability were sure to achieve a useful and satisfactory result. Hardly was sufficient leisure afforded for preparing a finished theological course, the library materials for reference were very incomplete, and, more than all, few erudite theologians could be consulted; yet these objections were overruled, and in obedience to the desires of his brothers, Bishop Kenrick set himself down to accomplish a task of no ordinary magnitude and yet of special importance. In the series of his best-known works, and which must have engaged the studious labors of many years, the first volume of his "*Theologiæ Dogmaticæ*" *Tractatus Tres, De Revelatione, De Ecclesia, et De Verbo Dei*, appeared from the press in Philadelphia. This was succeeded by the second volume, containing *Tractatus Generalis, De Christo Deo, De Sanctissima Trinitate, De Redemptore, De Gratia Christi*, in the year following, pp. 407. The third volume, issued also in 1840, contained his *Treatises De Baptismo, De Confirmatione, De Eucharistia, De Pœnitentia, De Indulgentiis, De Extrema Unctione*, pp. 411. Also, during the same year, the fourth and concluding volume of this learned theological work was published, and it contained the *Tracts: De Sacris Ordinibus, De*

Matrimonio, De Sacramentis in Universum, De Cultu Religioso, De Vita Futura. To this was added three most useful historical appendices: 1. Heresum et Schismatum Recensio; 2. Conciliorum Œcumenicorum Notitia; 3. Romanorum Pontificum Series, pp. 404.

But if the volumes published on "Dogmatic Theology" were most useful and necessary for exposition and defence of the faith; not less was it deemed to be essential, for ecclesiastical students in the seminaries then established, and likely soon to be increased in number, within the United States, to have a "Moral Theology" compiled, accommodated and applicable to the ecclesiastical laws or censures then in force, as also explaining the provisions of the general and subordinate constitutions in the civil code and jurisprudence so varied in the different States, and often referring to cases of conscience. Accordingly, the first volume of "Theologia Moralis" concinnata a Francisco Patricio Kenrick, Episcopo Arathensi, et Coadjutore Episcopi Philadelphiensis, was published at Philadelphia, MDCCCXLI., by Eugene Cummiskey. It contained the following treatises, "De Actibus Humanis," "De Conscientia," "De Lege Divina," "De Legibus Ecclesiasticis," "De Jure Gentium," "De Legibus Civilibus," "De Pecatis," "De Obligationibus Specialibus," pp. 404.

Next year, the second volume of this work appeared, containing the tracts "De Virtutibus Moralibus," "De Justicia," "De Contractibus," "De Virtute Religionis," pp. 411. The third volume did not appear until 1843, and it contained his treatises "De Sacramentis in Universum," "De Baptismo," "De Confirmatione," "De Eucharistia," "De Pœnitentia," "De Extrema Unctione," "De Ordine," "De Matrimonio," pp. 370. The Venerable Pontiff, Pope Gregory XVI. sent him apostolic letters approving of his episcopal actions and literary labors.

In 1841, he found time to issue a work, "The Catholic Doctrine of Justification Vindicated and Explained." Besides his various pastorals he wrote a letter on Christian Union, which attracted much attention and interest at the time of its issue. During this year, likewise, appeared his learned "Treatise on Baptism," most requisite to elucidate the many questions then debated, and especially in the United States, regarding its nature, mode and efficacy. In 1844 his highly esteemed book, "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated," was published. It is needless to state that the whole of that important subject has been thoroughly elucidated and explained in a manner to merit the just commendation of every Catholic reader.

When religious intolerance was manifested in those disgraceful riots, which broke out in 1844, and which caused such loss of life

and destruction of churches in Philadelphia, Bishop Kenrick issued an address counselling all Catholics to patience and preservation of the peace. This was a period of great excitement and alarm, but the prudence and influence of the bishop succeeded in allaying the bitter feelings, which were so wantonly provoked, while some of the leading non-Catholic citizens were moved to express sorrow and indignation at the outrages perpetrated by the mob, who for a time set the authorities at defiance. His writings likewise served to dissipate religious prejudices.

In 1849 the Bishop of Philadelphia published a work, "A Vindication of the Catholic Church;" its object was to exhibit and prove the claims and characteristics of Christ's Holy Spouse, "the Pillar and the Ground of Truth."

To return to the younger brother: In the year 1846, the Rt. Rev. Joseph Rosati, then in a state of failing health, having visited Rome and postulated his Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI., for a coadjutor and a successor in the person of Very Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, the first bishop of St. Louis, obtained his request. This was not in accordance with the wishes of the selected coadjutor, who would willingly have declined such promotion, and he protested, but in vain, that another sphere of life would better satisfy his aspirations. However, his Holiness would not yield, and Father Kenrick was obliged to submit. At that time Rt. Rev. Bishop Rosati had been nominated Apostolic Delegate from the Holy See for the purpose of negotiating a settlement of some ecclesiastical questions pending in the Republic of Hayti, and he had accepted that difficult and delicate trust.

Both Bishop Rosati and Father Kenrick returned to the United States, and arrived in Boston on the 18th of November, and soon afterwards setting out for Philadelphia, preparations were made for the episcopal consecration. The Church of St. Mary in that city had been selected as most appropriate for the performance of that sacred function. Bishop Rosati desired to be the consecrator of his coadjutor and immediate successor in the See of St. Louis. Accordingly, on the 30th of November, the Feast of St. Andrew the Apostle, 1841, the consecration took place, the Coadjutor-Bishop of Philadelphia, and Bishop Lefevre, the coadjutor of Detroit, being assistants. The celebrated Rt. Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston, preached on that occasion to a large and greatly interested congregation.

Thenceforth, on the Rt. Rev. Coadjutor-Bishop of St. Louis devolved the active administration of a diocese, then embracing a vast extent of territory. It included all Missouri and Illinois, with many distant regions towards the west, and even reaching to the Rocky Mountains, while at present forming so many independent

States. Now five Metropolitan Sees and twenty-one ordinary dioceses are included within it. Before that period not one Plenary Council had been held in the United States, and it is a unique distinction that the Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick is now the only prelate who has attended all those assemblages; on the last occasion of meeting in Baltimore, especial honors were paid him by his episcopal colleagues. After his consecration, the Rt. Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick did not remain long in Philadelphia before he set out for Missouri, and on the 24th of December he landed at St. Genevieve, where he was received by the Lazarists in their new college, and where he celebrated Mass on the morning of next day, which was Christmas. Soon afterwards he took passage for St. Louis, and when there he occupied the house adjoining the cathedral, and which has since disappeared to make room for other buildings.

On the 25th of September, 1843, the saintly Bishop Rosati departed this life in Rome, and Bishop Kenrick then succeeded him in St. Louis. Although buried in the beautiful little chapel dedicated to St. Vincent de Paul, and in the church of the Lazarists at Monte Citario, yet were the solemn obsequies for the dead celebrated with becoming ceremony in the cathedral church of his diocese.

In 1847, St. Louis was erected into an archbishopric. During those days the archbishop dwelt with the clergy attached to the cathedral, in a house adjoining and long since removed to make room for the presbytery which at present occupies a part of that site. He took upon himself the chief duty of preaching in English on Sundays and the greater festivals throughout the year, as the other priests were, for the most part, either French or German. His very appearance and manner in the pulpit were sermons, in reality; and when he spoke, always slowly, distinctly, and earnestly, it was easy to follow his statements and reasoning. The impressions produced on his hearers were serious and convincing. His accent and tone of voice were clear and far-reaching; while his figure, regular and handsome features, graceful gestures, and evident self-possession, with his mastery of subject, were admired by an ever attentive and delighted congregation. The executive labors and financial labors of Most Rev. Dr. Kenrick, in connection with ecclesiastical affairs, were then very engrossing, for he was constantly engaged in securing sites and obtaining title-deeds, for the purpose of building churches, religious institutions and schools. Even then he had a clear insight regarding the future growth of St. Louis. Money had to be procured, and debts often contracted were a cause of anxious concern in the midst of his many functions.

It was his custom, during the Lenten seasons, and after the evening devotions, to deliver a course of lectures, which were most instructive, in the cathedral; and these were admired, not alone by Catholics, but by many others of various denominations who assembled in the church. These were on a number of different subjects, dogmatic and moral; sometimes relating to the Evidences of Christianity, to Divine Revelation, to the Chief Mysteries of Religion, or to the Marks of the True Church; sometimes referring to the Sacraments, to the Ecclesiastical Law, to Religious Rites and Discipline, or to the Moral Virtues. Nor could he have devoted much time for the preparation of those questions which he treated, as he was otherwise busily employed during the early hours of the day. This practice, generally known throughout the city, induced numbers of non-Catholics to frequent the church, and having been interested and instructed by his arguments and expositions, they afterwards sought interviews with him or some of the city clergy. Thus many well-disposed and distinguished persons were afterwards received into the Church, and became fervent and exemplary Catholics.

It would be difficult to understand how he could manage the amount of executive and administrative work which had to be performed in his new capacity, did we not take into account the methodical and business-like order of his daily life, and the economical distribution of time, which he regarded as most precious for the proper fulfilment of every duty. His disciplinary habits assured him that much of it could not be wasted owing to the very early hour of five o'clock, at which he failed not to rise each morning. Then, he usually engaged after morning prayer in reciting the greater part of the divine office, so as to be prepared for the multiplied daily duties and labors which, afterwards, were sure to occupy his attention. He went each morning into the confessional before six o'clock, when he heard the confessions of many penitents. At six, he commenced the celebration of Mass in the cathedral, with a great spirit of devotion and reverence. Nothing could be more admirable than his exact distribution of time, as the writer, who lived with him, had frequently an opportunity for observing, while all the priests in the house attached to the cathedral, noticed how his varied duties and occupations succeeded each other, regularly as the clock told the hour. He was the earliest riser in the house, and long before others left their beds, he was systematically out, during the fine summer mornings, on the verandah, pacing noiselessly in soft slippers, while reciting most devoutly the divine offices. During the cold and short winter days, however, he arose and then lighted his own fire, and thus confined to his room he read by the lighted

lamp. He breakfasted at an early hour, and then withdrew to his library, which was retired from a parlor and an inner waiting-room. Soon afterwards, a succession of visitors, clergy and laity, Catholics and non-Catholics, arrived, and these interviews, on matters of business and interest, engaged the greater part of the forenoon; nor were they wholly discontinued at later hours of the day. Some snatches of time he managed to take for reading and writing; but it was always a curious mystery to speculate on what work he had been engaged, and, although it was observable that he kept piles of reference-books beside him, with sheets of manuscript and printed slips or revises, yet none of his priests chose to inquire about what he seemed to wish should remain a secret, until it became known to readers at large.

When, by direction of His Holiness Pope Pius IX., the first National Council of the Catholic Church in the United States assembled at Baltimore, May 6, 1849, he and the prelate of that see were the only archbishops of the twenty-six ordinaries who were present. Then it was recommended to Rome that the metropolitan dignity should be conferred upon New York, Cincinnati, New Orleans, and Oregon City. None of the suffragans then located in his province are now alive, while he is at present the senior prelate of the whole United States hierarchy, comprising thirteen archbishops and sixty-seven bishops, besides six vicars apostolic. After assuming charge of the St. Louis diocese, he seldom met the bishop, his brother, except on those occasions when he was obliged to assist at the Councils assembled in Baltimore, and when he took Philadelphia on his way in going or returning. Yet both had much to confer about in respect to their several charges, and their correspondence by letters was very constant.

On the death of Archbishop Eccleston in 1851, Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick of Philadelphia was transferred to the Archbishopric of Baltimore. At the same time he was appointed Apostolic Legate to preside over the first Plenary Council ever held in the United States. It was convened at Baltimore in 1852, and it was opened in a very imposing manner with solemn ceremonies. Its decrees were also fraught with important regulations for the interests of the Church throughout the United States.

The See of Baltimore was given a certain primacy of honor, in 1859, by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. This gave its occupant precedence over all other prelates in the United States.

When the great Confederate war broke out, the archbishop impressed upon his people their obligations and duties towards the general government. He also enjoined on them obedience to the laws and to the justly constituted authorities. His principal religious services were preceded by public prayers for the President

of the United States and for the Federal authorities. This practice he continued during the remainder of his life.

The Archbishop of Baltimore, at this time, had long been engaged on a work requiring great erudition and study to bring it out. This was nothing less than a new English translation, with numerous commentaries, of the Old and New Testaments. He had already published some volumes before his lamented death, but he did not live to complete it.

On the morning of July 8, 1863, the venerable archbishop was found dead, although no previous complaints of suffering or of ill-health had been heard from him. The mournful intelligence was soon diffused over Baltimore, and not alone the Catholics, but citizens of all denominations were profoundly grieved. With the speed of lightning and on the wings of the press, the message was borne to St. Louis; yet the archbishop had no intimation of his bereavement when he was preparing to celebrate Mass on the morning following. One of the priests attached to the cathedral, however, had read the telegraphic account in a St. Louis morning paper. Knowing that the archbishop had not then been notified, the priest approached him and pleadingly inquired if the archbishop's Mass could be offered for a most special intention. On assenting to such request, he was allowed to celebrate that Mass, and afterwards to make his usual thanksgiving before the priest announced to him that the Archbishop of Baltimore had died suddenly the morning before, and that the Holy Sacrifice just offered had been for the eternal repose of his soul. That a brother so endeared to him should have been so unexpectedly removed by death was painfully felt, and that it produced acute sorrow was well known, yet it seemed surprising to the priest conveying such news that it was received with apparently a heroic calmness and meek resignation to God's holy will, while thoughts too deep for utterance were buried in the soul of him who then only offered a short prayer invoking the divine mercy on behalf of one so long his guide, counsellor, and chiefest friend.

After the civil war was over, and when Missouri was destined to amend her old Constitution, the delegates who had assembled in convention for that purpose in April, 1865, adopted certain regulations respecting the clergy, of an imprudent and even of an illegal character. A most objectionable form of oath with certain conditions of reservation and test was sought to be imposed on them. This the archbishop of St. Louis and his priests strenuously refused to take, although for refusal to do so penalties were imposed. He would not allow to the State authorities those powers they claimed, for the giving of permission to preach the word of God, and for the discharge of other sacred functions.

This oath moreover he believed to be unconstitutional, and his opinion was fully confirmed by a subsequent declaration of the United States Supreme Court. In 1868, the archbishop, in company with his Vicar-General, Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Pastor of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, taking Ireland on the way, paid a visit to Rome, besides making a tour in other parts of Europe.

The disturbed state of society and of business consequent on the Confederate rebellion beginning to set in, the archbishop desired to relieve himself from further monetary responsibility in connection with his banking affairs. He showed a wise forecast of the property depreciation and commercial failures that soon began to prevail; so that when he resolved to wind up the financial concerns of the bank, he proposed, that if priests and congregations burdened with any debt for ecclesiastical institutions should pay one-half of it within a time fixed, he undertook to wipe out the remainder. Hitherto, he had been charged with numberless obligations as trustee for all church property within his diocese. His proposed plan succeeded in the most satisfactory manner, and he felt greatly relieved in mind when the liquidation was completed in every way to his satisfaction.

When the great Vatican Council was summoned to meet at Rome in 1870, by His Holiness Pope Pius IX., in company with nearly all the prelates of the United States, the archbishop of St. Louis attended, and the most important subject there considered and debated was the proposed dogma regarding the infallibility of the Pope in reference to decisions on faith and morals. While this doctrine had been received and upheld as a theological opinion by many learned doctors, others had maintained the contrary opinion, and believed, with the archbishop, that its definition was inopportune, and might prove injurious to religion, because among other reasons assigned, it was almost certain to be misunderstood by many non-Catholics. The action taken by His Grace of St. Louis is generally known, while his arguments against the definition are contained in a tract published at Naples, "*Oratio habenda, non habita.*" One of the leading prelates in the Council, and afterwards a Cardinal, inquired of Archbishop McCloskey, the late Cardinal of New York, what had been the character in the United States of that strange and courageous prelate of St. Louis. The archbishop replied, that he was a man of great virtue and great learning, and that the American bishops for thirty years had looked up to him as a model. However, when the doctrine had been defined, Archbishop Kenrick submitted fully to that definition. On his return to St. Louis, a splendid public reception awaited him, on the part of his priests and

people. An address was prepared, likewise, and read by the Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Vicar-General, in which allusion was made to his motives and action in the Vatican Council. This was pronounced before an immense congregation in the Church of St. John the Evangelist. To it a remarkable reply was publicly returned by the archbishop, in which while he briefly stated his motives for opposition to the definition of that proposed dogma, he added: "The motive of my submission is simply and singly the authority of the Catholic Church." Some years ago, while the present archbishop of Philadelphia was in Rome, the late Cardinal Manning said to him: "No two persons could be more opposed than the archbishop of St. Louis and myself at the council, but I am thoroughly convinced that he is a great priest and a good man."

Until the year 1872, the veteran prelate of St. Louis had continued the administration of his diocese without a bishop assistant; but at the solicitation of his many friends, who thought he was overtaxing himself, he applied to Rome for a coadjutor. His Vicar-General and Pastor of St. John the Evangelist's Church, Very Rev. Patrick John Ryan, had long ministered in the city, and—celebrated for gifts of oratory in an eminent degree, as also most zealous in the discharge of every sacerdotal duty—he had been recommended for that office. Accordingly he was appointed, with the title bishop of Tricomia, *in partibus infidelium*, and having right of succession to the See of St. Louis. His consecration took place on the 14th of April, 1872, the Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick officiating as consecrator, while a vast congregation was present during that solemn ceremony. This event gave a respite to the archbishop's labors, in relation to many of his episcopal functions, and his leisure moments were chiefly employed in study and pious exercises.

The See of Philadelphia having been vacant for a considerable time, His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. appointed the coadjutor bishop of St. Louis to that see, in June, 1884. Meanwhile, the city of St. Louis had made giant strides, and the growth of a Catholic population kept pace fully with its increase. Colleges and schools, churches and chapels, asylums and orphanages, hospitals and reformatories, orders and sodalities, conferences and associations, were established in every direction. Secular and religious clergy were numerous and ministered to the various wants of their respective congregations. Thus had the archbishop provided for every form of human misery, and for every object of Christian charity, during his long period of administration.

When the Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan had been removed from the Mound City, it was remarked as a curious coincidence that as

St. Louis had taken a bishop from Philadelphia in Dr. Rosati's day, she sent an archbishop back to it in return. At that time many friends of the aged prelate feared that the many duties of a multiplied character which had grown day by day must prove too onerous for their effective discharge, notwithstanding his great ability, natural energy, and force of character. However, he preferred resuming personally the active functions of the episcopacy and the entire administration of his see without extraneous aid; and on returning to the fatigue and responsibility of his exalted position, His Grace afforded uninterrupted evidence of ample mental and physical capacity and strength for the numerous demands on his time and exertions. The clergy and people of his diocese no doubt greatly rejoice that he has lived among them so long; but their very extreme solicitude for the continuance of his health and vigor has increased their desire that a coadjutor bishop should soon be appointed to relieve their venerated prelate from so many labors, and to afford him some rest, now naturally required by his remarkably protracted age.

The present Cardinal Gibbons having been preconized for the exalted position he occupies among the hierarchy of the United States by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., the same illustrious Pontiff designated Archbishop Kenrick to invest him with the official *insignia* of rank at Baltimore. The ceremony was one of special import, and it furnished occasion for rejoicing and congratulation not alone for those who were present, but for all Catholics throughout the United States. His Eminence then publicly addressed the archbishop and said:

"It is a great joy to me, most reverend father, that you, a prelate so distinguished, have been chosen by the Sovereign Pontiff to confer upon me the insignia of the exalted office to which I have been raised, not by my own merit, but by grace and favor of the Apostolic See. We venerate you as the senior of us all in years, as well as in episcopal ordination; but still more do we revere you for your learning, your piety, your unflagging zeal,—in a word, for all those virtues of a bishop which have for so many years made you an example and a shining light to our steps in the work of ruling our dioceses and feeding the flocks committed to us with the food of sound doctrine."

It is a circumstance of very rare occurrence that a priest should live to the fiftieth year of his ordination; but it is almost unexampled in the history of the Church that one of its bishops should survive to furnish the occasion for and to witness the celebration of his golden jubilee. Yet such was the case when, on the 30th of last November, the learned, pious, and venerable Peter Richard Kenrick attained such a memorable distinction.

A long term of years had been spent in unremitting labor and with the general approval not alone of his faithful priests and people, but of St. Louis citizens that were unrecognized as members of the Church when the archbishop reached the period of his silver jubilee. As is customary in the United States, an effort was then made to induce his consent to a grand demonstration of respect and affection. However, with his habitual aversion to any movement savoring of display, he positively refused to sanction such a proceeding, although urged with reasoning and persistency by some of his most devoted friends. One parting request was then pleasantly preferred by His Grace the present Archbishop of Philadelphia, Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, that when the date for his golden jubilee should arrive, no obstacle might be placed by Dr. Kenrick to its suitable celebration. With a self-conscious assurance that he should not reach such a term of life, the archbishop's consent was obtained for such a possible contingency; and accordingly, as his word was never known to be violated, the promise was well remembered, while as years rolled by his unimpaired good health afforded the expectation that it must be exacted in a manner alike worthy of the subject and of the object held in view.

For the arrangements projected on so extensive a scale, great expense must necessarily be incurred; but the wealth and liberality of the leading Catholics of the city and diocese were evinced in the large sums subscribed, while the clergy and other classes were spirited and generous in proportion to their means. A committee was formed, and it set steadily to work with the object of combining a thoroughly representative demonstration of respect and affection, while resolving that no charges whatever should be made from those persons entitled to be present in the public buildings prepared for the various services and ceremonies. The archbishop himself was assumed to be passive in the preliminaries, while his approval of all their proceedings was indirectly sought, and the venerable prelate graciously placed himself in the hands of his friends who had organized and directed them.

Many years have now elapsed since the writer had been ordained by His Grace in St. Louis, and the natural desire of assisting at the festival and ceremonies in course of procedure there urged a return to that city after a long absence, especially as the Archbishop of Dublin had not alone sanctioned such a tour but had cordially approved of it, with the additional honor conferred of being a representative to convey his warm congratulations to that venerable prelate. The president and professors of Maynooth were not wanting to express the feelings of his *alma mater*, while in his own name and in that of the parishioners of his native parish,

the Very Rev. Canon Daniel, P.P., of St. Nicholas, Dublin, resolved on presenting a handsomely illuminated address. Besides, a gift of Very Rev. Matthew Collier, P.P., of St. Agatha's Church, was among the most prized by His Grace of St. Louis as coming from his old friend and immediate successor in the curacy of Rathmines, and as being a fine copper-plate engraving of the Very Rev. Richard Kenrick, formerly parish priest of St. Nicholas of Myra, and whose charities and pastoral zeal have caused him to be most affectionately remembered by the people of that parish. Moreover, the portrait in question had actually belonged to the venerable Father Kenrick himself, and at the sale of his effects after death, it had been secured by Father Collier, then a young student.

It is needless to observe that a mission of this character was one presenting the most joyous anticipations of delight and satisfaction; but little was the writer prepared to realize in the actual demonstration a significance and splendor that characterized it on the whole, while the varied programme was carried out on a scale of grandeur and with an administrative ability that left nothing to be desired even in the details. However imperfect the description of such an interesting ceremonial may be, some brief notices may serve to give an idea of the manner in which the Catholics of St. Louis rejoiced over their aged prelate's life-long services among them.

Arriving in St. Louis after the middle of last November, the writer immediately visited the archbishop, who then occupied the house in which he had lived for several years previous. Meantime, the ladies of St. Louis, who took that special labor of love in hand, had furnished the new residence in a most elegant style. Furniture vans were then at the door conveying thither the archbishop's books and other articles of value. When ushered into his presence and after the first greetings had been exchanged, it was pleasing to observe that his features were still wonderfully well preserved, and that a clear complexion with a fresh color afforded evidence he enjoyed good health and vigor more than sufficient for his afternoon walk of three miles, which had yet to be taken.

Towards the close of that week preceding the ceremonial, His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, and Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia—who had been designated to preach the sermon in the old cathedral of St. Louis on the day of the golden jubilee—arrived in St. Louis. These with Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York and Most Rev. Dr. Williams, of Boston, were guests of the metropolitan archbishop.

On Sunday, November 29th, His Eminence, the Cardinal, and all the assembled archbishops, bishops and priests celebrated the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in some one or other of the city churches or chapels belonging to the various religious communities; while in several instances eloquent sermons were preached, and in which appropriate allusions were made to those circumstances that had brought so many from great distances to rejoice with the people. Afterwards the *Te Deum* was sung by the various choirs.

On Monday morning, November 30th, crowds wended their way from all directions towards the old Cathedral Church, to which access could only be obtained by special tickets. Meanwhile a cavalcade of horsemen consisting of young gentlemen of highest social position in the city were escorting His Grace, Archbishop Kenrick, Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishops Ryan, Corrigan and Williams from the Archbishop's residence to the Cathedral, the bells of which pealed forth a joyous welcome as the cortege approached. Awaiting the arrival of His Grace were more than four hundred priests in soutane and surplice drawn up in processional order within the Cathedral enclosure.

The Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated by His Eminence the Cardinal, Archbishop Kenrick assisting on a throne, while the music of Gounod's *Messe Solennelle* was beautifully rendered by a choir of fifty select singers under the direction of the musical professor, Mr. Joseph Otten, with an orchestra of thirty-six performers. After the conclusion of the gospel, the Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, advanced to a rostrum placed in front of the high altar and preached an elaborate discourse chiefly comprising a tasteful panegyric on the venerable jubilarian with a force and an eloquence calculated to impress deeply his distinguished and large audience.

When the religious ceremonies concluded in the Cathedral it was time to assemble for the clergy's banquet in the large dining room of the Lindell Hotel, and soon its corridor was filled with guests. The banquet hall was elegantly decorated, and the banquet itself was tastefully and abundantly provided for over 400 guests who sat down to dinner. Suitable toasts and speeches followed after the banquet; the Archbishop's health was proposed after an address on behalf of the clergy which was delivered by the Vicar General, Father P. P. Brady. To this the Archbishop responded in a few simple words.

In the evening, the grand torchlight procession started from the place of rendezvous. Precisely at eight o'clock, the various contingents of fifty-two city parishes, under the direction of the Grand Marshal, Julius S. Walsh, with their lighted lamps, began to file along Pine Street towards Grand Avenue. A body of the mounted

city police, commanded by Chief Harrigan, rode fourteen abreast and two deep, thus filling the entire street space, to keep the line of march open. Next moved the fine college band of the Christian Brothers, with their students in elegant uniforms. At the head of each parish was borne a transparency conspicuously displaying the name of the church patron and its number in the division. The columns on foot walked eight abreast. It was estimated that about 20,000 persons marched in line, and the Hon. D. R. Francis, Governor of Missouri, and the Mayor, Hon. E. A. Noonan, occupied a foremost place in the procession.

Arriving at the archbishop's residence, a blaze of bursting rockets rent the sky, and the spectacle was truly magnificent; while repeated cheers for the venerable prelate echoed from the ranks of the procession, and from the multitude assembled as spectators. The Archbishop and the Cardinal, with the Archbishop of New York and other visitors, took their station within the drawing-room of the mansion, and viewed the procession as it passed.

Perhaps one of the finest and most inspiring entertainments of the celebration, was the Children's Festival on the morning of Tuesday. This took place in the area of the Grand Music Hall, which has a capacity on the semicircular parterre and galleries to seat fully five thousand persons. The boys and girls were only a selection from the Catholic public schools and orphanages of the city, for the number had necessarily to be limited. The boys and girls of each band were arrayed in a costume different from every other section, and all marched in separate detachments from the Christian Brothers' and Nuns' schools or institutes, with their teachers at the head of the respective detachments.

At the hour designated, with his usual punctuality, the Archbishop of St. Louis entered the hall, accompanied by the Archbishop of Philadelphia solely, for an important meeting of the Cardinal and the other prelates had been assembled at that particular time in the Archbishop's house to arrange for the holding of a Catholic World's Congress during the Great Columbian Exhibition in Chicago.

The fine brass and stringed band of the Christian Brothers' Boys occupied the orchestra, and played selected airs at various intervals. They opened with the Golden Jubilee March, and this was followed by the childrens' Jubilee Chorus. Addresses were then read, and odes composed for the occasion were sung in the German, Bohemian, and Polish languages to fine national airs, children in the body of the hall taking up the refrain. Afterwards all the colored children throughout the hall joined in a jubilee ode. Other orphanages were in like manner received, and most touching was an address in their sign-language by the deaf mutes under the

charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph Convent, and this was interpreted in measured tones for His Grace's ear by a number of girls selected from other schools. Archbishop Ryan then thanked the children, in words suited to the occasion, on behalf of the archbishop of St. Louis who afterwards arose and pronounced a solemn benediction on all who were present.

On the evening of that day, and in the same hall, a numerous assemblage of ladies and gentlemen admitted by special tickets, awaited the arrival of His Grace, the Archbishop, His Eminence the Cardinal, and the other prelates who attended. The Hon. E. A. Noonan, the Catholic Mayor of St. Louis, on behalf of the citizens in general, delivered an address of congratulation; and he was followed by gentlemen representing various nationalities, who spoke in English, in German, in Italian, in Bohemian, in Polish, in French, and in Irish. The Governor of Missouri, Hon. D. R. Francis, also delivered an eloquent speech, in which he pronounced a glowing eulogy on His Grace the Archbishop.

The colored Catholics were represented by a Mr. Raphael F. Lewis of St. Elizabeth's parish, and he delivered an appropriate address in behalf of his liberated race. His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons then arose amid great applause and said: "I have been requested by the Archbishop, whose voice is too weak to be heard in so large an audience, to address you, and to thank the governor of the state, the mayor of the city and the general public, without regard to religion or race, for the well-merited honors which they have bestowed upon the Great Metropolitan of the West. He has received to-night honors and tributes of which any mortal might well be proud. Kings and emperors may exact tributes of gold or silver or money, but only true greatness and goodness of character and life can call forth tributes of the heart's affection and love such as have been poured out to night. Finally, let us all pray that the Lord will keep him among us for many years to come, and that when he passes away he may receive in Heaven a crown of everlasting glory."

Numberless congratulatory addresses and letters were received, to all of which it was quite impossible for the aged prelate to return a reply. One of those messages and gifts, however, had a peculiar significance; it came from His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., and through His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, being a finished portrait of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, set in a frame-work of gold and precious stones. When informed of this, the Archbishop wrote a letter of thanks, in which he assured the Holy Father that he should ever regard the portrait with especial favor, and that he should always keep it before his eyes during the hours of day, to remind him of that love and obedience he owed to the successor

of St. Peter. Among the congratulatory messages received was one from the President of the United States.

The theme, so comprehensive in itself, and selected for this article, must furnish an apology for its length.

A coming time shall doubtless engage the freer and fuller exercise of an intellect and of a pen worthy to cope with this most interesting and important biographical and historical subject. Thank God within our own memory, and through individual sacrifices and exertions, assisted by the influences of Divine Grace, great missionary works have been undertaken and gloriously achieved in the Catholic Church of the United States. Its further progress and triumphs may fairly be anticipated and predicted. Great and good men pass away from earth, but their deeds and examples have far-reaching results, and they should live likewise in the memory of all later generations.

JOHN CANON O'HANLON.

In Memoriam.

CARDINAL MANNING.

ON the fourteenth day of January last died Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. The Catholic Church in England and throughout the world on that day sustained a loss which, to human appreciation, appears well-nigh irreparable. Of the fact and extent of this loss the nations were acutely sensible. Rarely, if ever, has such a unanimous expression of grief been heard the world over as when this mighty man was laid low. Never, we venture to assert, have been accorded to any churchman such praises and honors even from non-Catholic sources as to the illustrious dead.

We may well ask what were the causes of this man's pre-eminence, whence the hold he maintained on the intellects and hearts of the millions who are sorrowing for him to-day? Why does his demise, long expected as it was, leave such a void in the English Church and such solicitude for her future? Why does Catholic England feel that she is orphaned and sorely distressed?

The answer may, we think, be found in the distinguishing note of Manning's whole career. His high vocation, and, following that vocation, his life-work was that of mediator. A mediator, from the very nature of the office, should, nay must, have something in common with both extremes of opposition. He must, by the reach of his intellect and the breadth of his sympathies, touch both at some points. He must understand their difficulties, their prejudices, their temperaments, their points of view. He should be able to place himself alternately, and in a sense simultaneously, in the position of both sides. Accordingly, when Divine Providence selects a great high priest in the office of mediator, it often leads him forth from one class or condition to another, enabling him to cherish all his warmth of affection for those he has left, and unites him by the bonds of new found love to those whose brother he has become. His own great heart becomes a centre, drawing other hearts from the right and from the left till hands meet, in the grasp of fellowship and in the recognition of a common humanity and destiny.

Such a man was the great prelate of these latter days. His whole energies and aims were those of mediator. As the radical parson at Lavington, bringing squire and clown into better mutual

understanding ; as the great advocate of infallibility,—how vividly do we remember him as he moved from seat to seat in the council chamber of the Vatican,—with argument and appeal, smoothing difficulties without receding one inch from the stand he took ; as the second Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, slowly but surely with tongue and pen working out a peaceful, persistent revolution in English religious thought ; as a member of innumerable commissions looking to the adjustment of the relations between rich and poor ; standing between need and greed with hands of entreaty ; again standing forth for the purity of the women of England against the wiles of lust in the modern Babylon where his lot was cast ; pleading in the very evening of his days for the rights of dock laborers ; surrendering for them the ease and comfort which his weight of years so imperatively demanded ; as the valiant champion of Christian education for the waif of the alleys and the slums ; as the steadfast friend of Ireland, he was always and in every issue the mediator. Of him, more than of any man in this present generation, or even century, it can be truly said : *In tempore iracundiæ factus est reconciliatio.*

His colossal labors for the relief of the oppressed and distressed form part of the history of to-day. It were vain in this place to attempt even a brief outline of them. They are fresh in the minds of those who follow the trend of current thought and action.

What stands out, however, in boldest relief, as it appears to us, is his high achievement in bearing aloft in his own beloved England the banner of Catholic faith, his life-long work of conciliation, the profound impress he wrought upon the national life of his country, the large space he occupied upon the canvas of contemporary religious life.

Few of us upon this side of the Atlantic can realize the immense difference in the status of the Catholic Church in England between the time of Wiseman and the latter days of Cardinal Manning's career. We are removed in time and space from the outbreak of bigotry and violence which marked the nomination of the former to the See of Westminster and the re-establishment of the hierarchy in England. Yet some of us can dimly at least recall the no-papery yells which resounded throughout the land, the determination to resist Papal aggression by force, the threats of violence to the persons of representatives of the old faith, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill of Lord John Russell, the cordons of police required for the protection of Archbishop Wiseman while engaged in his episcopal functions, the threats even against his life. It was a revival of the worst epochs of blind fanaticism which have been such a blot upon English history.

But what a change from those days ! Manning needed no civic or military guard. He was walled around by the affections of his

countrymen. He was not only safe but honored and revered as he stood at the foot of Nelson's monument pleading the noble cause of Temperance. Shoreditch and Seven Dials and Whitechapel—haunts of misery and crime—were as safe for him at midnight as Piccadilly or Belgravia at high noon. Whenever the public conscience was deeply stirred by the sudden flashing of the search-lights of the press on England's festering moral sores Manning was called into the council chamber with prince and peer and Anglican prelate. Beyond any dignitary of the Church of England, nay beyond their united influence, he was a power in the land. In every attack by good men upon high-handedness, false policy, precipitately unjust action or downright moral rottenness he was in the forefront of the battle. And thus under his sturdy, moderate, conciliatory, yet indomitable lead the name of Catholic, their social influence steadily advanced until from being despised Nazarenes, suspects, outcasts from their birthright, in the public estimation incapable, by reason of their religious tenets, of loyalty to the Crown, they gained their rightful place, and in peace and in war, in the soft amenities of life as in the crises of a nation they proved afresh, what we always knew, that a Catholic should never yield and never does yield to any in loyalty to his country.

After allowing for the softening influence of the spread of mutual knowledge and the progress of civilization no doubt remains, but that the greater part of this vast change is directly due to the influence and towering personality of Cardinal Manning. His quarter of a century's mediatorship between the estranged sections of the English people wrought good which this generation of Catholics never hoped to see. Nor could the narrow boundaries of one sea-girt nation limit his vast influence. We all know how it has reacted on this broad continent, how in every English-speaking land his name, irrespective of creed, has been enshrined in every heart, and his manliness, his great mental gifts, his labors by pen and tongue, his love of the poor and the outcast have become the precious heritage of humanity.

The year 1887 was a momentous one for the Catholic Church in the United States. The Knights of Labor, a body then of vast numbers, were threatened with excommunication. Well meaning men were alarmed at their growing influence. A change in the social structure appeared imminent. For a time it seemed likely that the masses, intoxicated by power drawn from compact organization, would at length control the classes. Labor, heretofore so submissive, seemed in a position to dictate any terms to capital. A profound uneasiness, not without some warrant, took possession of timid minds. Great pressure was brought to bear upon Rome for and against the labor organizations. It was a most anxious time for those who had the welfare of the Church at heart. In

that hour of crisis the voice of Manning rang out clear and strong urging the Holy See to trust to the moderation and good sense of the Catholics of this Republic; and in this, as in all politico-religious questions, to seek information from the bishops, who have their fingers upon the pulses of the public conscience, and are best qualified by the intimate knowledge of their surroundings to pass upon a great question of policy. None more than he knew the drift and temper of our days. "The Holy See," he urged, "under the changed and changing conditions of society, would henceforth be called upon to deal with the people rather than with princes." The result is well known. Moderate counsels prevailed. The Holy See abstained from anything that would appear to savor of precipitate action. The great question has slowly passed out of the sphere of pressing issues.

Now that the living voice, so often raised in the sacred causes of justice and mercy, is stilled forever, we may be permitted to reproduce here the great prelate's affectionate message, by phonograph, to the Catholics of the United States:

"The Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster sends greeting to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore, to the Catholics of the United States, and to the people of America, and prays that we may all be of one heart and one mind, in the one fold and one Shepherd."

As he was to us, so was he to all the world. His love of God overflowed on humanity, embracing in its wide sweep the humblest of His creatures. His career was the sublimest Catholic philosophy and theology in daily action. His every deed, the daily tenor of his life, was upon the lines of the highest Christian ideals. It was a day of triumph and of joy to Cardinal Manning when he read the magnificent Encyclical of the Holy Father on the labor question, and found embodied and developed in that immortal document the principles of humanity for which, during his whole episcopal career, he had been strenuously contending. In him the Holy See always found a staunch adherent and a wise and fearless adviser.

More than perhaps any other Catholic prelate he understood how to accommodate himself to his environment and to the changes which time necessarily brings. He was always for conciliation where no sacrifice of principle was involved. He was essentially a man of the times, fully abreast of nineteenth century demands and nineteenth century progress. Long will his name be in benediction, and those who have the interest of the Church of God at heart will pray fervently that Divine Providence will give us such men in numbers, to be, after their Divine Model, the light of the world.

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

JOHN GILMARY SHEA.

TO none is the death of the illustrious and erudite scholar, John Gilmary Shea, LL.D., a source of deeper sorrow, than to the editors and the proprietors of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW. By his departure from earth they have lost one of their oldest and most highly esteemed contributors. His connection with the REVIEW, and his warm interest in it, began with its very inception, and continued without interruption or abatement till the day of his death. Its first number, published January, 1876, contained an interesting and learned article from his pen on "The Catholic Church in American History." For the January number of 1891, though in feeble health, he wrote a lucid and forcible article on "The Latin Vulgate Civilizing Western Europe." During the intervening period of fifteen years he wrote for the REVIEW no less than forty-seven articles—a much larger number than any other contributor to its pages has furnished. These articles embrace a great variety of topics and are all of permanent value; careful, thoughtful and thorough expositions of the subjects they respectively treat. Subsequent to his last article, in January, 1891, he was solicited by the editors of the REVIEW to write other articles on subjects with which it was known that he was thoroughly acquainted and in which he felt a deep interest. Owing to his physical infirmities and his belief that he had not long to live, and that, therefore, he ought to devote all his time and energies to the completion of the great work he had undertaken—"The History of the Catholic Church in the United States,"—he declined to accede to our request. "*Quoniam advesperascit*," he wrote to one of the editors, "*et inclinata est jam dies*."

On Dr. Shea's many and varied acquirements, his knowledge of languages both ancient and modern, his antiquarian lore, his diligence in prosecuting his investigations, his careful discrimination in arranging and collating the results of his researches, his power of analysis and marvellous ability to seize the right clue and thread his way safely through labyrinths of confused statements, and separate truth from falsehood, rejecting the one and giving its due value to the other, we shall not dwell. These characteristics of Dr. Shea are well known to all who have read his writings, and they were all the more admirable because in him they were combined with utmost simplicity and truthfulness. It is of these last named qualities in Dr. Shea we most love to think. In our estimation they were the qualities he himself loved best and most carefully fostered. They give him a stronger claim to the admi-

ration and esteem of all who prize truth and sincerity, than do even his rare intellectual gifts and acquirements.

In this brief tribute to the memory of Dr. Shea we make no reference to the almost countless magazine articles, essays, pamphlets and books on various subjects which emanated from his fruitful pen, ever constantly and untiringly employed from early youth, till death terminated his eminently useful career. Our purpose simply is to express our high estimate of Dr. Shea's contributions to the REVIEW, leaving it to others in the present and the future to describe his invaluable services to literature and religion in other spheres of labor.

May he rest in peace.

Scientific Chronicle.

SOME LIGHT-HOUSES IN OTHER LANDS.

HISTORY does not clearly inform us when the use of guiding lights for sailors was first introduced, but it must naturally have been at a very early period. When men began to paddle their first frail boats along the shores and to venture by degrees a little further from land, yet being very careful to keep it always in sight, it must have happened that at times they were belated on the return. In such cases the advantage of a signal light on the shore would easily suggest itself, but, unhappily, the name of the one who first put this idea in practice has been lost to history. We offer him, however, even at this late day, our sincere thanks.

Probably the sea-lights mentioned in the *Odyssey* of Homer, and in the Greek poem of Hero and Leander, were merely fires kindled on the headlands. A passage in the *Iliad* (xix. 369 *et seq.*) has been understood by some to refer to a beacon-light. Homer is not writing a treatise on marine engineering, but describing the armor of his hero, Achilles. We think the passage will be better understood by giving at the same time a few lines of the context in the beautiful language of the original.

Κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἐθηκεν
 Καλὰς, ἀργυρέουσιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρνίας·
 Δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσι ἐδυνεν.
 Ἄμφι δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον,
 Χάλκεον· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε
 Εἵλετο, τοῦ δ' ἀπάνευθε σέλας γένετ', ἥντε μῆνης.
 Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανῇ
 Καιόμενοι πυρός· τὸ δὲ καίεται ὑψόθ' ὄρεσφιν,
 Σταθμῷ ἐν οἰσπόλῳ· τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντας ἄελλαι
 Ποντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φίλων ἀπάνευθε φέρονσιν·
 Ὡς ἂπ' Ἀχιλλῆος σάκος σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε
 Καλοῖ, δαιδαλέου.

A strictly literal, prose translation, which we give for the benefit of our lady readers, must of necessity be tame and unpoetical; but, since Pope tried it in verse and made a mess of it, we prefer to give it its undiluted state.

He (Achilles) first put around his shapely legs the greaves, neatly fastened with silver clasps, and then around his breast his coat of mail. From his shoulders he slung his brazen sword, with silver studs adorned, and then took up his great, strong shield, whose splendor, like to that of the moon, shone afar. But as when from the deep is reflected on the sailors a flame of burning fire which blazes high in a lonely spot on the

mountains, while the storms drive the unwilling sailors far from their friends on the fish-filled sea, so the splendor from the beautiful, cunningly wrought shield of Achilles flashed up to the skies.

If Homer knew of beacon lights, then Virgil could hardly have been ignorant of them, and he is said to have stated that one was placed on a tower of the temple of Apollo, on Mount Leucas, "the light of which, visible far out at sea warned and guided mariners." It is thought too by some that the more than gigantic statue, the Colossus of Rhodes, erected about 300 B.C., showed from its uplifted hand a signal light, just as our "Goddess of Liberty," in New York harbor, does to-day. The champions of the "lost arts" have not yet, however, as far as we have heard, claimed that it was an electric light, though we should hardly be surprised to hear of their doing so, on the first favorable occasion.

The first light-house about the existence of which there can be no possible doubt, was the famous one on the island of Pharos, near Alexandria, in Egypt. This building was the frustum of a square pyramid, surrounded by a large base, the precise dimensions of which are not known. It was commenced by the first Ptolemy and finished about the year 280 B.C. The style and workmanship are represented to have been superb, and the material was a white stone. The height was about 400 feet; and it is stated by Josephus that the light, which was always kept burning on its top at night, was visible about 40 miles. There must be a slight error here, for from the deck of any craft known in Josephus' time that light could not have been visible more than 30 miles. Anyhow it was worthy of its great builder, and was ranked as one of the seven wonders of the world. It lasted for at least 1600 years, and was possibly destroyed by an earthquake, but the date of its destruction is unknown. On account of the name of the island, the word *pharos* is used to this day for light-house in English, as *phare* is in French, and *faro* in Spanish.

In the first century of our era mention is made by Pliny, Suetonius and others of light-houses at Ravenna, Ostia and elsewhere, though scarcely any details have come down to us. During this same first century, under the auspices of the Roman emperor, Trajan, who was himself of Spanish birth, a magnificent light-house was built at Corunna, looking out on the Atlantic from the northwest coast of Spain. It remained in active service till A.D., 1634, at which time it was taken down and reconstructed. This light, the oldest in existence, almost coeval with Christianity, has, therefore, been shining for more than eighteen centuries. What scenes it has witnessed! what memories it recalls! what tales it could tell of the Roman, the Moor, the Spaniard! of struggles, defeats and victories! What acts of crime and of heroic virtue, in the long years it has looked upon. Columbus gazed upon it many a time. It is shining yet, and may it never fail till the last seawandering son of Adam has furled his last sail in the great haven of rest, on the shore of the other, the eternal sea. A light, infinitely more glorious still, will welcome him there.

Coming down to more modern times, we meet with the remarkable

Cardouan light-house, which was begun in 1584 and finished in 1610 by Louis de Foix, the construction having occupied 26 years. It is situated on a ledge of rocks in the mouth of the river Garonne, in the Bay of Biscay. The ledge is about 3000 feet long by 1500 broad, and is bare at low water. It is surrounded by detached rocks, upon which the sea breaks with terrific violence. There is but one place of access, which is a passage 300 feet wide, where there are no rocks, and which leads to within 600 feet of the tower.

The construction differs considerably from that of most modern light-houses. A foundation was built of solid cut stone, in the form of a frustum of a cone, the lower base being 135 feet, the upper 125 feet in diameter, and the height 16 feet, a space for a cellar and water cistern, 20 feet square and 8 feet deep, having been left in the centre. On the east side is a stone staircase, by which access to the upper base is obtained. The tower proper rests on this unique foundation. A parapet wall, 12 feet high and 11 feet thick at the top, is built entirely around the upper base and serves to break the force of the waves before reaching the tower itself. The space between this wall and the tower is solidly roofed in and contains the apartments of the keepers. The tower is 50 feet in diameter at its base, and diminishes as it ascends. It is 115 feet high and is surmounted by two lanterns, one above the other, the combined height of which is 31 feet, thus making a total height from the bed-rock to the top of 162 feet. Internally the tower is divided into four stories, all of different orders of architecture, highly ornamented, and adorned with the busts and statues of kings of France and of heathen gods. The material is stone throughout.

The lower story appears to have been intended as a store room; the second is called the king's apartments; the third is a chapel; the fourth is the lower lantern. A spiral staircase leads from one story to another. The upper lantern is, or rather was, a stone dome supported on eight stone columns. In this upper dome a fire of wood was kept burning at night for over 100 years, when, in 1717, the fire having weakened the stone columns, the upper lantern was taken down and the light kept up in the lower lantern. The light did not prove satisfactory and in 1727 an iron lantern was erected in place of the one taken down, and coal was substituted for wood as a combustible. The Cardouan has been standing for 282 years and is still considered the finest light-house in the world.

The Eddystone light has had an eventful history. The rock on which it stands is one of a group lying about 14 miles off the shore near Plymouth, England, and is exposed to the full force of the southwestern seas. Closely clustered gneiss rocks cover a distance of about 700 feet in a north and south direction, while detached masses reach out about the same distance east and west. The highest part of the rock on which the successive light-houses, exclusive of the present one, have been built just at high water level. The rise and fall of the tide is 16 feet. The first tower was designed by Henry Winstanley. The lower part, to a height of 12 feet, was a polygonal prism, 24 feet in di-

ameter. On this was erected a wooden building resembling a pagoda. The height to the top of the lantern, which was glazed, was about 80 feet. It was begun in 1696 and the light exhibited in 1698, but the storms of the following winter proved it defective; it was neither high enough to keep its head always above water, nor strong enough to promise endurance. It was, therefore, strengthened by the addition of a course of masonry four feet thick, all around the outside, and the height was increased to 120 feet. To render it more stable it was filled in solid to a height of 20 feet above the foundations. And now the light-house laughed back to the laugh of the ocean. Ah, but the ocean does not always smile. Three years later, in November, 1703, Winstanley, with a party of workmen, went to the light-house to make some repairs. On the 26th of the month a violent storm arose, and when it had passed it was found that light-house and inmates were gone, nor was any trace of either ever seen again.

Winstanley's fatal errors were, first in the use of a polygonal instead of a circular form, and secondly in adding exterior ornamentation, both of which hindered the smooth and easy flow of the waves up and down and around the tower.

Rudyard took in hand the work of building the next Eddystone tower. It was begun in 1706 and completed in 1709. It was a frustum of a cone, 92 feet high, 26 feet in diameter at the base, and 15 feet at the cornice. The work consisted principally of timber, the lower part being oak carefully bolted together and also to the rock. Iron was also used as stays, and the whole was filled in with stone to the depth of 27 feet, in order to overcome the buoyancy of the water, and resist the shock of the waves. How long it might have been able to do battle with wind and wave no one can tell, for after it had stood bravely for 46 years it was accidentally destroyed by fire. The fire commenced in the lantern in the early part of the night, and the keepers retreated from story to story till they reached the rock. Happily the weather permitted the approach of a boat, and they were rescued early in the morning.

Eddystone was rebellious, but it had to be conquered. The next to try his hand at planting a light-house on these rocks was John Smeaton. He was born in Austhorpe, in 1724, and was only 32 years old when this difficult undertaking was entrusted to him. The work was begun in 1756 and completed in 1759. The tower was 93 feet in total height, of which 77 feet consisted of masonry, the remaining 16 feet, which constituted the lantern, being of iron and wood. Smeaton introduced a great improvement in constructions of this class, by the use of large hewn stones of about a ton weight each, and especially by dovetailing the stones of each course together, and dowelling the different courses to one another, so that when set with hydraulic cement the whole structure was almost as strong as if cut out of the solid rock. This plan has been adopted in the construction of the most important stone light-houses ever since.

Smeaton has been highly praised for his work, and no doubt de-

servedly, yet there have not been wanting those who have thought it defective in some points. He somehow got an idea that the best form of tower to resist the buffeting of the waves would be the one which nature gives to the trunk of his own English oak to enable it to resist the action of the winds, that is, a curved vertical outline, splaying widely at the base. Alan Stevenson, however, believes he has shown this idea of Smeaton's to be a fallacy. Be this as it may, it proved unsuitable for that particular place.

The rock on which the tower was built is rather small, so that the lowest course of masonry, if continued round to a complete circle, could be but 32 feet in diameter. But the surface of the rock, instead of being level, was so slanting that the lower courses, till the highest point of the rock was reached, could only be laid part way round. When that height was reached the effect of the adoption of the tree-trunk idea was to narrow the tower to 26 feet in diameter, and this was still further reduced to 15 feet, by the time the coping was reached. This, say the critics, was certainly too small for a stone tower in such an exposed condition.

Another source of weakness was said to be found in the manner of constructing the floors. They were built as regular arches, keystone and all, but with only a very small rise in the centre. They naturally exerted an outward thrust against the walls all around. This thrust may be easily met in a building which has only wind pressures to resist, but when there is question of resisting the repeated blows of hundreds of tons of water, moving at a varying and unknown velocity, it is quite a different matter. Every blow jars the tower a little and gives the arches a chance to settle down a little, and that little is never recovered, and so by degrees things get loose and shaky, and sooner or later something must give.

In 1878 Mr. Douglas stated that "for several years the safety of the Eddystone had been a matter of anxiety and watchful care to the corporation of the Trinity House (an English Light-house Board), owing to the great tremor of the building with each wave stroke." Consequently, after an existence of 120 years it had to be taken down. It was also reported that the rock on which it had stood had been partly undermined by the action of the waves. In that case, one would be inclined to ask if, after all, it was not the vibrations of the rock which threatened the light-house, rather than any defect inherent in the building itself. At all events, the new one, completed by Douglass in 1882, was placed on another rock of the group. We have been unable to obtain, up to date, any details about its construction. Will it last as long as Smeaton's? We will hardly live to see.

Bell Rock Light House is another famous structure. This rock is off the east coast of Scotland, in the German Ocean. It is 427 feet long by 230 feet broad, but the "dangerous area" is about five times that size. The spring tides have a rise and fall of 16 feet; when the tide is "out" the principal rock is bare to a depth of four feet, and is covered by 12 feet of water when the tide is "in."

The tower was designed and built by Robert Stevenson, an eminent Scotch engineer. The bill for this work was introduced into Parliament in 1802. It took more than four years to get it through, and this, with a wait of some months for a favorable season of the year, delayed the beginning of the work till the summer of 1807. It was completed in 1810, the doing actually taking less time than the talking. In February, 1811, it was lighted up for the first time.

The form adopted was similar to that of Smeaton's tower, but Smeaton's errors were not repeated. We do not say this in disparagement of his talents and genius. He was undoubtedly a great engineer, and led the way in which others had but to follow. He made two mistakes, to which we have already alluded; the first, that of putting a tree trunk tower on a rock which was too small for that form. It is, however, an admirable form in itself, and where the circumstances of the location permit its adoption there is no fault to be found with it. The other mistake, which any one else would probably have made till taught better by experience, was the arching of the floors.

Profiting by both the good and the bad points of his predecessor's work, Stevenson has given us a magnificent structure in the Bell Rock Tower. The outer casing to a height of 30 feet is granite, the rest of masonry being of Scotch sandstone, which is found in abundance on the mainland near by. The stone work, including a six foot parapet which surmounts the tower proper, is $102\frac{1}{2}$ feet high; the lantern rises $15\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the parapet, thus making a total height of 118 feet. The diameter of the lowest course of masonry is 42 feet, that of the one just below the cornice is 15 feet. The first 33 feet from the base is filled up solid throughout. The space remaining above is divided into six stories. The floors, instead of being arched, are flat. They are of stone, stiffened with iron, and they extend entirely through the walls, thus binding the latter together and being a source of strength instead of a cause of weakness. The tower weighs 2076 tons.

Turn we now to the west coast of Scotland. At a distance of 50 miles out is the little island of Tyree, and 12 miles southwest of the island is a group of dangerous rocks named the Skerryvores. They lie in the track of large vessels passing round the north of Ireland, from Glasgow and Liverpool, and have been the occasion of many sad wrecks. In 1814 authorization was obtained to place a light-house on these rocks. The survey, which, strangely enough, was not completed till 20 years later, disclosed among the group the existence of a flat rock of solid gneiss, 160 feet long by 70 feet broad, and on this it was determined to build the tower. Besides its solidity and ample proportions, this rock has the advantage of being a little above high water level. The engineer chosen for this undertaking was Alan Stevenson, son of the engineer of the Bell Rock Tower.

Work was begun in 1838, and the light first shown in 1844. The form of the tower is a solid of revolution generated by revolving a rectangular hyperbola about its asymptote. There now! It is built entirely of granite. The diameter of the base is 42 feet, narrowing to 16 feet at

the top. The height of the masonry is 138 feet; to the top of the lantern, 154 feet. The solid portion is 26 feet high, above which the walls vary from a maximum thickness of $9\frac{1}{2}$ feet to a minimum, at the top, of two feet. Above the solid work the tower is divided into ten stories. The total weight is 4308 tons; the cost of materials and erection was £87,000 or about \$435,000.

The Scilly Islands lie 25 miles west by south, off Land's End, Cornwall, and 40 miles west from the Lizard Point. They are a cluster of about forty islands, some of which are inhabited; others are mere rocks which have well earned their reputation of "dangerous." Belonging to these, but still somewhat apart from the main group, and exposed to the worst storms of the Atlantic, is the Bishop Rock. At the highest tides it is covered to a depth of 19 feet; at the lowest tides it is just awash. A light-house was built here in 1852 by J. N. Douglass, after designs of James Walker. The masonry stands 100 feet above high water, but from the foundation to the weather vane the tower measures 145 feet, of which the lower 39 feet are solid. The walls vary from 9 feet to 2 feet in thickness. The bottom and top diameters are 34 and 17 feet respectively. The force of the waves is so great at this place that the tower began, some time ago, to show signs of weakening, and it became necessary to strengthen it with an internal structure of iron-work. Eventually it will probably have to be replaced.

A light-house quite similar to that on the Bishop Rock is the one at Carlingford, on the east coast of Ireland, built in 1830. It stands in 12 feet of water and is 111 feet high. Further details we have been unable to obtain.

A light-house on the west coast of France, on the Héhaux de Brehat, is said to be a noble and ornamental structure. It is about 150 feet high. Up to date we have failed to receive any description.

About midway between the Scilly Islands and the Lizards is another dreaded rock, the Wolf, covered at high tide by 12 feet of water. The necessity of a light at this point was long acknowledged, and a tower was planned for it by Robert Stevenson in 1823. It took 39 years to unwind all the red tape in which the project was swathed. A posthumous design by Walker was approved of in 1862, and the work was entrusted to the same Douglas, who built the Bishop Rock Light. It took eight summers to finish it, but so treacherous are the seas at this place, that in all that time only 101 working days could be counted.

In this case a new form was tried, the vertical curve being a segment of an ellipse. What particular virtue there may be in this more than in the hyperbola of Alan Stevenson is not luminously clear. From the rock to the base of the lantern is $116\frac{1}{2}$ feet, the total height being 135 feet of which 35 feet is solid. The two diameters are 42 and 17 feet. The tower contains nine stories, a peculiarity of which is that they increase in size from the lowest upward, the bottom one having a diameter of 7 feet, the top one of $12\frac{1}{2}$ feet. The total weight is 3296 tons; the cost was £62,756, about \$313,780.

One feature of this structure has been severely criticized, that is, the

scarcements, or grooves and projections, in the lower courses of masonry. It is said that they were intended to break up the waves. This, as has been said in speaking of Winstanley's Eddystone, is not a correct principle; a better one is: 'The more you let the water alone, the more it will leave you alone.'

The Dhu Heartach Rock, which rises 35 feet above high water, is situated 14 miles from Mull, one of the Hebrides. The tower was planned and erected by D. and T. Stevenson, who spent six summers at the work. Its total height is 135 feet, the greatest diameter being 36 feet, decreasing to 16 feet at the cornice. The shaft is solid for 32 feet above the rock, the floor of the lowest story being thus 67 feet above high water. The weight is 3115 tons, of which considerably more than one-half is in the solid part. The outline is a parabola; and so, the cone itself and three of the conic sections having been tried, some engineer, seeking for fame by being different from everybody else, ought to give us the remaining possible form, viz., an arc of a circle.

There are many light-houses, scattered all over the world, well worthy of attention and admiration, but we have already trespassed too far on the patience of our readers. Besides, the ones we have touched upon, have been the models on which many others have been planned. We reserve for a future article, the light-houses of our own country.

Let us now turn our attention to a few points closely connected with the matter in hand. The construction of light-houses is a branch of marine engineering which calls for talents of the highest order. The conditions vary so widely in different cases that general rules are of but a limited application.

For example, it might be thought at first sight that the Eddystone Rock would be the most difficult place of all those named above on which to plant and maintain a light-house, and the fact that the present one is the fourth built on that spot inside of 200 years seems to confirm it. Nevertheless, on second thought, this seems more than doubtful. Thomas Stevenson says: "During a summer gale, when Dhu Heartach light-house was being erected, fourteen stones each of two tons weight, which had been fixed on the tower by joggles and Portland cement, at the level of 37 feet above high water, were torn out and swept off into deep water. At Bell Rock stones of two tons weight were several times swept away during the construction of the tower, while it is a remarkable fact that no stones were ever moved at the Eddystone. But what is more striking, the thin glass panes of Winstanley's first tower stood successfully through a whole winter's storms at the same level above the water as that at which the fourteen heavy blocks were swept away at Dhu Heartach, where it was found necessary from the experience acquired when constructing the light-house to raise the solid base of the tower to nearly the same height above the water as the glass panes in Smeaton's tower, which have hardly ever been broken during the storms of more than a hundred years. The conclusion, then, which seems fairly deducible from these facts, is that the level of the plane of dangerous impact of the waves above high water depends upon the relation subsisting be-

tween their height and the configuration of the rocks above and below high water, as well as perhaps on the configuration of the bottom of the sea near the light-house. Thus, while the rock at Dhu Heartach, from its height above high water (35 feet), forms a projection against the smaller class of waves, it operates as a dangerous conductor to the largest waves, enabling them to exert a powerful horizontal force at a much higher level than they would had the rock been lower."

This quotation may seem very long, but we could not see our way to breaking it up without running the risk of missing the point. The facts are well stated, but what shall we say of the explanation? To us it seems woefully unclear and unsatisfactory. That vague "relation between the height of the waves and the configuration of the rocks" is about as lucid as the directions for making a steam engine: "Get a sufficient quantity of steam and make your engine." One might lawfully conclude that the proper course, in the case of the Dhu Heartach Rock, would have been to blast it to sea-level before building the tower, so that the waves would strike it *at a lower point*. We do not think Mr. Stevenson would admit the conclusion, though he has fairly posed the premises.

Let us add our mite to this discussion. If it does not help to clear it up much, it can, at the worst, hardly render it more obscure. The whole business seems to be a question of water-waves.

Two kinds of water-waves are known to exist, viz., waves of *oscillation* and waves of *translation*. The simplest case is this: Take a pebble and throw it into the still water of a pond, at some distance from the shore. Where the pebble sinks there will be formed a depression more or less deep according to the size of the stone and the velocity of its fall. When the water at that spot, has reached its lowest point it must needs rise again; but on account of the momentum it acquires in rising it will mount higher than its original level, then sink below it again; and this down-and-up motion will continue, growing, however, all the time beautifully less, on account of the resistance of friction, until it ceases entirely and the water is again at rest. Now, because of the cohesion which exists between adjacent particles, the descending ones drag their neighbors down after them all around, and these in turn *their* neighbors, and so on. Hence there is formed in the water a circular depression whose centre is the spot where the pebble fell. As it takes time for this motion to be communicated from point to point, each particle in descending will necessarily lag a little behind the one which set it in motion. Each particle, therefore (counting in order from the centre outward) will reach its lowest point a little later than its inside neighbor; the depression will consequently travel gradually outward all around. But, as we have said, the water at the centre, having reached its lowest point, will ascend even higher than its original level. In doing so each particle will drag its neighbor after it, and this action will give rise to an elevation which will start out, all around the centre, in pursuit of the depression first formed. So long as the sinking and rising at the centre is kept up, so long will

these depressions and elevations follow each other in succession, and since they are circular they present the appearance of continually expanding rings. Technically, they are called *waves of oscillation*. A depressed and an elevated ring taken together constitute a complete wave. The highest point of an elevated ring is the *crest*, the lowest point of a depressed ring is the *trough* of the wave. If the oscillations at the centre are in perfect time, which is usually the case, the distance from the crest of any wave to that of the next will be everywhere the same, and this distance is the *wave-length*. The wave-length may be anything from a minute fraction of an inch to hundreds of miles, according to circumstances. The *wave* moves forward *continuously* from the centre of disturbance, but the water itself does not. It rises and falls, not all at once, for, as we have seen, it takes time for the motion to be communicated from point to point, and hence every point of each wave-length is at a different part or phase of its oscillation at any given instant. There is some movement in a radial direction, for as the water sinks it must spread out both forward and backward from the highest point, and as it rises it must be drawn in from front and rear toward the crest. But as each crest, with its accompanying trough, continually advances, the water itself *appears* to travel forward continuously. A body floating on the surface of the water will move with the water, that is, it will rise and fall, advance and recede; but it will not move continuously away from its original position.

Now let us try another experiment. We will take a perfectly smooth cylinder of iron, or other heavy material, having a base just large enough to make it stand fairly steady. We will place it upright in the water in such a way that its upper end will be some distance above the surface. Under such conditions the tendency of the waves to overturn the cylinder will ordinarily be slight. The water will rise and fall vertically along the cylinder, and, by its buoyancy, will slightly lessen the pressure of the cylinder on the bottom. The water, in its forward motion, will exert on the cylinder a pressure in that direction, and in its backward motion a pressure backward; but when the cylinder is just in the crest or in the trough, the wave exerts no pressure on it in either direction. The change from forward to backward pressure takes place so gradually that there is in it nothing of the nature of a blow or shock, and waves of this kind would usually have but little effect.

Still, there is a possible case in which the stability of our cylinder might be in danger. Every body naturally tends to vibrate at a certain rate, and that rate depends upon the dimensions and weight of the body. It is just supposable that the natural vibration period of our cylinder might happen to coincide with the time-period of the waves. In that case, the effects of the impulses would accumulate and might end by upsetting the cylinder. The chance of this taking place would, however, according to the "doctrine of probabilities," be but one among millions.

Waves of *translation* are quite different from waves of oscillation.

When a wave of oscillation nears a shore or other shallow place, the vertical motion of the water is more or less interfered with. The upward motion is free, but the downward motion is hindered by the bottom. In sinking, the wave must therefore spread out, and as it is urged on from behind, this spreading must take place mainly in a forward direction. A body of water moving thus forward in a heap is called a wave of *translation*. Each oscillating wave, then, as it arrives at a place too shallow for the freedom of its motion, is changed into a wave of translation. Unlike the wave of oscillation, it strikes a decided blow against any obstacle standing in its path, and its energy is proportionate to its magnitude and velocity and these depend on the size of the wave of oscillation from which it was generated. They depend also on the "configuration" of the shore both below and above the general water-level; if the water be shallow for a very long distance out the wave of translation will be flattened more and more as it travels onward, and will have but little energy left when it finally reaches the bank. If, on the contrary, the water be very deep, even quite close up to the land, such a wave will scarcely be formed at all. Between these two extreme cases there will be a particular slope of the shore, which will give a maximum result, but just what that slope should be has, as far as we know, never been satisfactorily determined.

Besides the mere slope of the shore there is another possible element of its configuration, whose effect is well known. When the advancing body of water (wave of translation) arrives at an inlet whose sides converge, it must accommodate itself to the continually narrowing passage and hence must rise higher and higher until its momentum is entirely spent, and this is often many times higher than it would have been on a straight stretch of shore. This will also happen, but to a less extent, when the wave passes between large masses of rocks.

Another well-known phenomenon is worth noticing in this connection. When a wave of translation is driving onward, the portion in contact with the bottom is greatly retarded by friction, each layer above less so, and the surface layers very little indeed. The result is that the upper portion keeps gaining always on the lower, and the motion of the whole thus becomes a sort of half sliding, half rolling motion, and this lasts until the surface water shoots clear ahead. This gives us the breaker. The water now having been carried by its momentum higher than the general level, it must needs retreat. In the advance the water underneath comes to a halt first, because its velocity was less. It therefore begins to retreat before the water above has finished its forward motion. This is what constitutes the *undertow*.

Gentle reader, if you have indulgently followed us thus far, without any skips, you may possibly have begun to imagine that your reporter has been dragged away in the undertow of his wave motions, and has lost sight of his light-houses entirely. Not so; but it is time to get out of the pond.

On the ocean, waves of pure oscillation on a large scale are rare. Sometimes, however, they have been caused by submarine explosions,

volcanic or seismic. An instance of this kind was furnished by the earthquake which destroyed the city of Shimoda, Japan, in 1854. The waves reached San Francisco in $12\frac{1}{2}$ hours, the distance being 4500 miles; the rate of travel was therefore 360 miles an hour. In 1868 a great earthquake occurred in Peru. The waves which it generated were observed in Alaska, the Sandwich Islands and Australia. In the deeper water of the Atlantic such waves have been known to travel at the rate of 700 miles an hour. The waves from Shimoda followed each other into San Francisco at an interval of 23 minutes, corresponding to a wave-length of 150 miles. The depth from crest to trough was $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet. Waves of this class have been called very improperly tidal waves. They have no connection with the tides.

Ordinary ocean waves are produced by the action of the wind, and though mainly oscillatory, they partake, to a greater or less extent, of the nature of waves of translation, into which they become almost completely transformed on reaching the coast.

From what we have seen, it is evident that a light-house, far out from shore, or on an isolated rock just large enough to hold it, the sides of the rock being very steep, would be less liable to be carried away than would one where the configuration of the shore was such as to change the waves of oscillation into waves of translation just before reaching the tower. The final word about the Eddystone and the Dhu Heartach is, that there must be a great difference in the slope of the ocean bed at those two spots.

If now, reader, you contemplate entering on the career of a light-house constructor, the following hints may be found useful.

Make the tower as heavy as possible and get its centre of gravity quite low, so that it will not be liable to be upset by the waves. It is useless to *fasten* a stone tower to the rock, for if be not heavy enough to stand firm on its own account it is not worth having, and any fastenings would only mask the danger without averting it.

Stone is about twice as heavy as sea-water, and when the water rises around the tower it lifts nearly one-half of the weight of the part immersed. On this account alone the foothold becomes less secure, and this, together with the straining backward and forward by the waves of oscillation and the blows of the waves of translation, produces a state of affairs most trying and terribly severe on a structure even as strong as a light-house. Iron, on the other hand, is about seven times as heavy as water. Therefore only about one-seventh of its weight would be lifted by the buoyancy of the water, and its so-called inertia is more than three times that of stone. In very dangerous positions, then, if the foundations be sufficiently strong, why not make your light-house of cast iron? It could be cast in blocks, with projections to fit and grip each other securely. It could be kept from rusting by paint, or better, could be copper-plated by the electric battery. Of course it would cost more than stone, but just think what a consolation it would be to the long-expected New Zealander, when he comes around on his artis-

tic tour, to find one at least of the works of the nineteenth century not fallen to ruins. We "vote early and often" for iron.

In any case, make the horizontal section of your tower circular, and allow no exterior projections of any kind at any point below the cornice. Then all will go smoothly, up and down and around. In the vertical section, the outline may be either a straight line or a portion of an ellipse, or of a parabola, or of an hyperbola (or an arc of a circle?). Where practicable, a curve is better than a straight line, because the upper walls need not then be so thick, and the centre of gravity is thus brought lower down.

The height of the tower must be such that under the worst conditions the water will never reach the lantern.

You will probably want to get into your tower; for that purpose you will need a door. This will naturally enter into the lowest story and be placed on the side where the force of the waves is least. This will not necessarily be on the side facing the nearest land, but may be on the side of the open sea. At times the safest side has been determined by observing on which side of the rocks sea-weeds grow most luxuriantly, for hardy as they are, they seek the most sheltered spots.

You will want a little light here and there. This can be had by means of windows. Put them on the same side as the door, but be sparing as to their number, and dimensions. We think by following these directions carefully you will have a fair chance of building a good light-house and of having it remain.

FLEXIBLE GLASS.

ANY one who has seriously reflected on the matter, must surely be convinced that one of the most important factors in modern civilization is glass. Without it, our houses would still be but little better than wigwams. Without it, we could have no microscopes, and so the whole wondrous world of "God's little things," animate and inanimate, would have remained forever unknown. Without it, we could have no telescopes, and so our knowledge of the magnificent world of "God's great things," would have always remained poor and meagre indeed. Without it, we could have, practically, little physics, and still less chemistry; and hence, the greater part of the material progress of the world would come to a dead halt, or rather it would never have had a real start. From this point of view, at least, we would still be barbarians.

Were we to attempt to enumerate all the uses to which glass is put, uses in which it could not have been replaced by any other known substance, we would never end, and hence we judge it wiser for the purposes of these notes not to begin.

Admirably as it is suited to numberless purposes, glass has, nevertheless, for certain uses, some undesirable qualities, chief among which is

its brittleness. "Brittle as glass," has long since passed into an axiomatic comparison, about the justness of which there is supposed to be no room left for doubting. Our bills for window-panes, and lamp-chimneys, and tumblers and goblets (if we are inclined that way), and for a thousand other articles of frequent use, tell the tale plainly enough.

The average man can mend a broken wheelbarrow, the average woman can darn an ancient stocking, but either of them would have to be a good deal above the average before being able to cut a square of glass to size to repair a broken window. And this is about the easiest and simplest operation one could be called upon to perform upon glass. Ask your man of average intelligence, now, to bore a hole through a plate of glass, and he will suddenly remember that he has an appointment elsewhere. And then, if there were question of actually *making* an object, such as a lamp-chimney, or a goblet—well, of course, only skilled workmen could do that.

Many attempts have been made to produce a glass which would be tough enough to stand hard usage and be workable by ordinary tools in the hands of the unskilled. The first of these qualities has, indeed, been secured by the invention of De la Bastie, which consists in heating the article after it has been worked up into its final form till it begins to soften, and then plunging it suddenly into a bath of oil. The result is a glass exceedingly hard and strong, but it cannot afterwards be worked cold. The attempt to cut it with a diamond results, it is said, in a total disintegration of the whole article, which immediately falls to fine powder. This process, therefore, solves one difficulty by introducing another and a much worse one.

The latest improvement which has come to our notice is due to Herr Eckstein, an Austrian engineer, who claims to have invented a substitute capable of replacing ordinary glass, and which will have about all of its good and none of its bad qualities. We confess that the process of manufacture, as given in the current scientific journals, is rather vaguely described, but such as it is, we reproduce it for the benefit of our readers.

Dissolve from four to eight parts of collodion cotton in one per cent. by weight of alcohol or ether. (We suspect the translator has inadvertently made a slip of some kind here, for, with the best of intentions, we have been unable to make out what "one per cent. of four to eight parts" means.) This solution is to be intimately mixed with from two to four per cent. of castor oil, or other non-resinous oil, and from four to ten per cent. of resin or Canada balsam. Next spread the mixture on a smooth surface, say a plate of glass, and dry it by a current of air heated to 122° F. In a short time it is transformed into a vitreous mass, transparent, flexible, almost unbreakable, and much lighter than ordinary glass. The material thus obtained is said to be proof against acids, alkalies and salts. If all this be true, Herr Eckstein has certainly invented a very useful substance; still we may be allowed to think that the glass-trade need not fear total extinction just yet.

The new substance, which has been named *flexible glass*, may replace

the ordinary kind for some purposes, especially as window-panes, and, perhaps, drinking vessels; but, for most other purposes, we fear it would not do. It would not answer for chemical ware, for it is inflammable; and we would want it subjected to a long and exhaustive trial before we would be willing to trust it for bottles of pure drugs and chemicals. We doubt, too, about its general serviceableness for physical apparatus, and, in fine, for any purpose where it would be subjected to high temperatures. However, the inventor himself, who is well aware of these drawbacks, is making further efforts to improve it, and we only hope that his efforts may be crowned with success.

A NEW STAR IN AURIGA.

FROM the day when the fifty oars, manned by the sons of gods, kept time to the harmony of Orpheus' voice and lyre, on the eventful journey of Jason on board the Argo to steal the golden fleece, when Auriga, the Charioteer, received a "local habitation and a name" he has faithfully carried Capella amid the starry hosts of heaven. As a reward of his fidelity a new jewel has been added to his crown, but this time the crown is around the ankle of the left leg. The new star or *Nova Aurigæ*, as it is called, is near χ and 26 *Aurigæ* and these stars are just above the left ankle of the Charioteer. But leaving the fantastic conceptions of the ancients and using the orthodox method of exact science, its location as determined at Harvard Observatory is: Right Ascension 5h. 25m. 33s., and Declination $30^{\circ} 22' 14''$. To the uninitiated truth may appear stranger than fiction. For their benefit we shall briefly state that Right Ascension corresponds to longitude on the earth, and Declination to latitude. As we know the position of a place on the earth when we know its latitude and longitude, so we know the location of a star in the heavens when we know its Right Ascension and its Declination. The *Nova* was photographed at Harvard on December 1st, 10th, and 20th, 1891, two months before it was known to be a new star. It happened that Professor Pickering and his assistants were then photographing that region of the heavens, in pursuance of the plan now being executed at Harvard of preparing a photographic map of the stars and their spectra. From these photographs it appears that the *Nova* was faint on December 1st, bright on the 10th, and had reached its maximum on the 20th.

The first recognition of the new comer was given on an anonymous postal card dated January 2, 1892, and addressed to Professor Copeland, of the Edinburgh Observatory. The card read; "Nova in Auriga. In Milky Way about two degrees south of χ Aurigæ, preceding 26 Aurigæ. Fifth magnitude, slightly brighter than χ ." The writer of this card, Thomas D. Anderson, of Edinburgh, Scotland, makes himself known in *Nature*, where he gives the following account of his observations. "It was visible as a star of the fifth magnitude for two or three days, very probably even for a week, before Professor Copeland received my postal

card. I am almost certain that at two o'clock on the morning of Sunday, January 24th, I saw a fifth magnitude star making a large obtuse angle with β Tauri and χ Aurigæ, and I am positive that I saw it at least twice subsequently during that week. Unfortunately, I mistook it on each occasion for 26 Aurigæ, merely remarking to myself that 26 was a much brighter star than I used to think it. It was only on the morning of Sunday, the 31st of January, that I satisfied myself that it was a strange body." Since the announcement made by Mr. Anderson, the *Nova* has been carefully watched at all the principal observatories, its brightness determined, its spectrum studied, and from all the results thus far reached it seems to be a new star, which astronomers will have an opportunity to study in its process of evolution. It may be a "long-period variable" which at its maximum reaches the brightness of a fifth magnitude star, and at its minimum becomes so faint as to escape detection. In any case, if it wanes it will be carefully followed during its retreat into obscurity, and astronomers will gladly glean from it any message it may have to announce.

ELECTRIC LIGHTS AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

WHATEVER else may be said of the managers of the approaching World's Fair, it certainly cannot be said that they "love the darkness"; on the contrary they are taking measures to be more than liberal in the matter of light. The plans approved and adopted for illuminating the grounds and buildings, when the great time comes, are on the most magnificent scale. They provide for 6776 arc lights of 2000 candle power each, and for 131,452 incandescent lamps of 16 candle power each, in all an amount of illumination equal to 3,358,132 standard candles. The Paris Exposition was a great undertaking and a great success, but in the matter of light Chicago will be far ahead. The wiring for the lights will be about ten times as extensive as it was at Paris, and will cost about \$1,500,000. Engines aggregating 22,000 horse-power will be required to run the dynamos for this illumination. Some people find it difficult to understand how a steam engine can produce light. It is very simple. The radiant energy (light and heat) of the sun got locked up ages ago, in the primeval vegetation of the infant earth; the primeval vegetation got old, sickened, died and fell, pretty much in a few heaps, and became changed into coal, all the while hanging on stoutly to its heat-and-light-giving energy; man comes along and sets the coal on fire; the coal then gives up its energy to the water in the boiler, turning it to steam; the steam gives up its energy (now the energy of pressure) to the engine; the engine gives up its energy (now the energy of motion) to the wires and magnets of the dynamo, and this energy of motion becomes electrical energy; the electrical energy of the dynamo is given up to the so-called lamps, and in them becomes again the energy of heat and light. All this is clear, too clear to be

disputed; that is, the facts, at each stage of the transformation are evident, but if you ask *how* the transformations are accomplished, you will hardly find a satisfactory answer.

"How does the rose draw its crimson from the dark brown earth, or the lily its shining white? Answer me this, son of man, and I will answer thee the other riddles of the universe."

The cycle is complete, but there are immense losses at each transformation on the way; losses due to the imperfections of our methods of transformation, but we know of no better ones just now. The cycle is complete, and, were it not for those losses, we might begin over again, and, had we time to wait, see the energy of our electric light stored up in a new vegetation, that vegetation turned into coal, the coal burned, the water turned to steam, the engine run, the dynamo worked, the light burst forth anew. The cycle is complete, but while we look on with admiration and wonder, we ought not to stop short at that, but should look back with something more than admiration and wonder to the One who first put that energy into the sun and started the great cycle, and guides it yet, on its mysterious, awe-inspiring course.

CROSSING THE ATLANTIC IN THREE DAYS.

In the days "befo' de wah," steamboat racing on the Mississippi was of frequent occurrence, at least so we are told in the veracious history books of those days. No chance for a trial of speed was ever left slip by the crews of rival companies, and every means, safe and risky, would be employed in order to win. It used even to be said, though we don't care to vouch for it, that it was not unusual to seat a young gentleman of color on the lever of the safety-valve to regulate the steam pressure. If he kept his seat, or the seat kept him, till the race was over, all was well. If the boat was blown up, another was built to take its place, and those who were left over from the former explosion were ready to try it again. But in the end the practice had to be given up, because in language more expressive than elegant, "it didn't pay."

We wonder now whether the racing going on across the Atlantic Ocean will pay in the end. It is true we have little fear of explosions. The owners of our ocean steamships are too shrewd, and there is too much at stake in the way of life and property, especially property, to allow on the Atlantic, a repetition of the dare-devil doings on the Mississippi. Still the ocean steamships are virtually racing, and the Old, as well as the New world, is egging them on. Not so very long ago, people were content if they were out of sight of land not more than ten or twelve days, in crossing the Atlantic. Later, ships were designed and built to reduce that time by degrees to as little as six days. Next comes the magnificent "Majestic" beating her own and all other previous records by making the trips from Queenstown to Sandy Hook in 5

days, 18 hours and eight minutes. We draw a long breath, and think we will bet on the "Majestic," every time, when the "Teutonic" sails in and reports that she has beaten everything on the earth, or rather on the water, by making the same voyage in 5 days, 16 hours and 31 minutes. Before this goes to press, the scales may turn again and the "Majestic" or some other ship be ahead even of this last record. Be that as it may, Mr. Carl Schurz, President of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company, states that he believes it possible to build a steamship to cross the ocean in *three* days. He would build a ship for passenger service only, and make it much larger than any now existing. He would then put in two distinct sets of powerful machinery, driving twin screws, either set being sufficient to propel the vessel as fast as any ship now afloat. Ah, well, it is difficult in these days to prophesy just what will be possible a few years hence, but knowing what a tremendous resistance is offered by the inertia of the water to the motion of a body moving in it, and knowing that this resistance increases in a much higher ratio than the speed itself, it is hard to believe that, without a radical change in the form of our ships, one could be made to come up to Mr. Schurz's prediction. Even if it could, would it pay? On both these points, the highest authorities, as well among engineers as ship owners, disagree. For the present then we think it unsafe to prophesy, and so we refrain.

FISHING BY ELECTRIC LIGHT.

Perhaps it is not an original remark to say that history repeats itself, nevertheless it often comes very near being true. As an instance we might recall the fact that the late American Indians used to go a fishing at night time, and carry lighted torches with which to attract the fish. Considering that fishes usually live in rather poorly lighted quarters, a few canoes provided with flaming torches must have been to them very like what a Fourth of July fireworks exhibition formerly was to ourselves, a thing of beauty and a joy forever, at least till they got caught. The noble white man, taking his cue from his red brother, learned to fish too by artificial illumination, and found it a success. But now, no longer content to make use of last year's political-procession torch, he must needs try the electric light. The result of this move has fairly startled the fishes and astonished the fishers. Formerly the best that could be done was to have the light above the water and depend on the fish coming up to the light; now we are more accommodating, and carry the war into Africa, by letting the light down into the very domains of fishdom itself. This, of course, can be done only by means of the incandescent electric lamp. When used in this manner, especially in connection with nets, myriads of fishes, great and small, are attracted and the hauls are immense, so much so that in the case of the salmon fisheries there is danger of overdoing it, and of rendering the species extinct. This would be as bad as killing the hen that laid the golden egg.

A curious incident is related in this matter of electric fishing. On one occasion in some experiments that were being made in this line, a very small lamp, called the pea-lamp, was used. The light was observed to be extinguished, and it was thought the lamp was broken. The net was hauled up and in it was found, among others, an extra large fish having the conducting wires in his mouth. Investigation proved that he had swallowed the lamp, light and all, and it was drawn out still burning up to its full candle power. Although it is a story of a fish, there is nothing improbable in it. The glass of the little lamp was scarcely warmer than the water, but it would not have remained so very long after its introduction into the stomach of the fish, and the diagnosis of the finny doctors would probably have been: "Inflammation of the stomach." Anyhow, it is a clear case of a novel kind of interior illumination.

AN ENORMOUS MICROSCOPE.

THE word "enormous" has, in this case, no special reference to the size or weight of the instrument in question, as if, for example, a camel or an elephant would be required for its transportation. It is merely intended to convey the idea that the microscope is one of very great magnifying power. There are, of course various kinds of microscopes, but we will pass over the classification just now, with the mere remark that, in one kind you look through the lenses at the object which is placed beyond, while in another kind a strong light is directed through the lenses upon the object, the enlarged image of which is received upon a screen. The one under consideration is of this latter kind.

Ordinarily, a microscope magnifying 1000 diameters would be considered a high-power instrument. The new microscope is calculated for a magnifying power of 16,000 diameters. Let us try to get a grip on this. The paper on which this REVIEW is printed is about the $\frac{1}{32}$ of an inch in thickness. If that thickness were magnified to the full power of this microscope, a single leaf would appear to be 5 feet 4 inches in thickness, while the thickness of an entire number would become more than the $\frac{1}{8}$ of a mile, its width $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles, and its length about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles! Truly, a ponderous tome.

The great microscope is under construction at the Poeller Physical Institute of Munich, being expressly intended for exhibition at the Columbian Fair.

However, lest orders for duplicates should be sent in too fast, it is announced that the cost of the microscope will be about \$10,000. The light to be used for the projection of the images will be an electric light of 11,000 candle-power, and as this would heat the instrument unduly, and render focussing next to impossible, a special automatic spray of liquid carbonic acid has been contrived for the purpose of keeping things cool.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

Book Notices.

THE STATE LAST. A Study of Dr. Bouquillon's Pamphlet. Education : to whom does it belong? By Rev. James Conway, S. J. Pustet & Co.

In our opinion, this masterful exposition and defence of the Catholic position as to the place and power of the State in education either terminates finally the so-called "Great Controversy," or sets the issue beyond the possibility of a misunderstanding. The discussion is now ended, or it has not yet fairly begun. We think our readers will join us in the hope that the former alternative will be verified. It is extremely gratifying to us to perceive that the stand taken by this REVIEW from the beginning in favor of free schools in a free State has been shown to be correct, and that the educational articles which from time to time have appeared in our pages have been appealed to as authoritative. Certainly no subject has been more repeatedly treated by able writers. Some may have thought we had given too much space to the investigation of a topic concerning which there seemed to be no dissension among Catholics.

After all that has been written during the past four months we remain where we were last year. The obligation still lies upon us of erecting and supporting our parochial schools and of keeping a vigilant eye upon the ever increasing tendency of the State to diminish our freedom of action. As attention has sufficiently been drawn to the evil consequences likely to flow from a controversy in which a section of Catholics were accused (justly or unjustly), of being willing to surrender the education of our youth into the control of the State, we prefer to draw general attention to the consoling fact that this alleged spirit has received, from all sides, a stinging rebuke. It has been clearly demonstrated that the bare cry raised of *our parochial schools in danger* is sufficient to bring to the surface an amount of stern determination which had been unsuspected because Catholics are usually calm and self-restrained. The Catholic schools of the country do not exist merely by sufferance of the State; their right to existence, founded in the rights of the family, are prior to the rights of the State; nor do we recognize in the State any other right than that of respecting, since it will do nothing to aid or foster them.

The clamor which is raised every now and then for the "un-American" institution of compulsory education is occasioned by the wrong-headedness of the State in refusing to recognize the grand educational agency which is near at hand in the Catholic Church. Holy Church has within her bosom a fully equipped machinery for educating youth, in her teaching orders, male and female, in her revealed doctrines and in her sacraments. The State, instead of invoking the aid of her most powerful auxiliary, attempts to frown down every effort of the Church by what is practically a *prohibitive tariff*. Catholics are not, indeed, excluded as educators, as their fathers were in penal days; they are simply subjected to a double taxation. Religion is looked upon as a luxury, and like other luxuries in this country, made the subject of a heavy taxation. The issue is so clear between us and the State that it is not in the power of sophistry to obscure it. The Catholic school is an essential condition to the perpetuation of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the

Catholic Church alone whose life is bound up in the denominational school. Were it not for the heavy burden which such a school entails, every denomination in the land would be supporting its own school; and it is precisely because Catholics stand almost alone in their effort to establish their own schools, that the Catholic religion represents about all that is left of Christianity in the United States.

We regard it, therefore, as a very promising outlook, that so few have given any sign of weariness at the long continuation of the struggle for Christian education. If the effort is burdensome, the reward is great and tangible. It is well to remember too, that we can stand the present anomalous condition better and longer than the State party; and the longer we do endure it, the more advantageous will be the terms of compromise when the time comes for discussing a *modus vivendi*.

Thanks to the statesmanlike action of Governor Pattison in returning a prompt veto to the "act to provide for the attendance of children at schools of this Commonwealth, and a supervisory board of education," the citizens of Pennsylvania have been so far spared the dangerous experiment of State-control which has bred trouble in less-favored portions of the Union. We commend to the serious meditation of our readers the following passage of his Excellency's remarks:

"This legislation" (House Bill, No. 143), "is the first step taken by our Commonwealth in the direction of compulsory education. That feature of a Common School system involves serious political, educational and social problems. They have not yet been satisfactorily solved by the experience of other states. In grappling with them, therefore, it is needful that sure ground should be occupied, in order that it may be successfully maintained. The State has provided, with increasing liberality, for the education of all the children of all its citizens. While it has furnished the opportunity to all, it has imposed the obligation of attendance upon none. Free attendance upon free schools seems to best befit a free people. I am well aware of the necessity claimed to exist for compelling certain classes of the people to avail themselves of the opportunity offered them; but compulsory education is such an invasion upon existing systems in our Commonwealth, that if it is to be inaugurated, it should be done under the most favorable circumstances. It will not avail to pass a law of uncertain character or so widely at variance with the popular sense of what is just that it shall be a dead letter on the statute books."

We have only one exception to take to these weighty utterances of our excellent Governor. It is not exact that "the State has provided, with increasing liberality, for the education of *all* the children of *all* its citizens." There are hundreds of schools frequented by thousands of children in Pennsylvania, schools recognized by Bill 143 as suitable for the education of youth, for which the State has nevertheless made no provision whatsoever. We do not ask the Governor to suggest to the legislature the "unconstitutional" measure of making an appropriation in favor of parochial schools. We simply remark that the lauded generosity of the State is expended upon one portion of the citizens to the exclusion, and at the expense, of another portion. Or did the framers of Bill 143 imagine they were exercising "increasing generosity" by condescending to recognize the existence and sufficiency of parochial schools at all? Certainly a man like Governor Pattison who had the intelligence to perceive that the projected compulsory act was "*widely at variance with the popular sense of what is just*," could not fall into the grosser error of maintaining that the State has provided for the education of *all* the children, simply because it has built, or is willing to

build, schools to be conducted on a system opposed to the conscientious convictions of a large section of the population. This last error would be greater than the first; for the vetoed Bill, by permitting the youth to be educated in parochial schools admitted by clear implication that the present "public school" system was inadequate to the task of properly educating "all the children of all the citizens."

The trouble arises from the timid, left-handed way in which the Commonwealth recognizes the educational agency of the Catholic Church. An educator she undoubtedly is, and always has been. She is extremely desirous of educating all the children of all her members. She has, as we have already said, her own authorized agents in her Teaching Orders. She is admirably in condition not only to instruct well disposed and well provided for children, but to care for the orphan and homeless, and to reform the wayward and fallen. She interferes with no one outside her pale; her efforts are confined to caring for her own household of the faith. If those who declaim so loudly "of the necessity . . . for compelling certain classes of the people to avail themselves of the opportunities offered them," would only recognize the necessity of giving financial aid and encouragement to the Church in her great work, we should more readily believe that their protestations are inspired by a pure love for the diffusion of knowledge. As it is, the State has not only incapacitated itself by an ill-advised amendment to the Constitution from aiding the Church, but forces Catholics to support two systems of schools, their own parochial system which they maintain from conscientious motives, and the *so-called* "public school system" which is based on principles which their conscience condemns. Heretofore, the State has respected our freedom of education fairly well; and "for this relief much thanks." All that we now ask, and all that we have any immediate prospect of obtaining, is that the State continue to pursue this "generous" policy. Until some sage shall arise in Church or State who shall devise a means of reconciliation acceptable to both sides we shall pursue the even tenor of our way. In proportion as our churches are built and paid for, we are increasingly in condition to provide for the fuller equipment and development of our parochial school system. If the clergy and faithful of the present generation have had the energy to look after the building of both the Church and the school, what is to prevent our successors from accomplishing the comparatively easy task of providing for the needs of the school alone? Let the grand struggle for Christian education go bravely on! Instead of pining away in useless regrets that no crumb of the State's "increasing generosity" is thrown to our poor schools, let us be thankful for the freedom allowed us of controlling our own schools in our own way. It is less than we are entitled to, but it is vastly more than our afflicted brethren in Europe can obtain.

HAR-MOAD; OR, THE MOUNTAIN OF THE ASSEMBLY. A series of archæological studies from the standpoint of the Cuneiform inscriptions. By *Rev. O. D. Müller, D.D.*, member of the American Oriental Society; of the Archæological Institute of America; of the Victoria Institute or the Philosophical Society of Great Britain, etc. With portrait of the author and plate illustrations. North Adams, Mass. Published by Stephen M. Whipple, 110 Main Street. 1892.

1. We read in Is. xiv., 13 ff.: "Thou saidst in thine heart: I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the North; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the uttermost parts

of the pit . . ." Though some commentators have understood this passage of the fallen angels, the great majority of them have seen in it a description of Babylon's pride and fall. Without excluding an allegorical reference to Lucifer, which may still be admitted in spite of scientific cavil, writers on Sacred Scripture have of late changed their explanations of the "mount of congregation" occurring in the prophet's threat. Formerly it was supposed that the King of Babylon boastfully spoke of ascending Mount Zion, and ruling there instead of Israel's Jehovah. Now we know that the Assyrians admitted the existence of a great Asiatic Olympus, a mountain-residence of the gods. This is precisely Isaiah's mount of the congregation or mountain of the assembly, the Har-Moad. Dr. Miller's archæological studies endeavor to collect the ancient traditions existing among the various nations of antiquity so far as they have reference to this mount of congregation, and to derive from them the proper archæological and historical inferences.

Had Dr. Miller limited his work to the gathering of the various national traditions, it would deserve far greater commendation than we can give it in its present form. "The author's philosophy crops out repeatedly in his work" says Mr. Whipple in his instruction "How to read this book" given on page 6. Now an author who writes in sober earnest: "As well attempt to communicate with empty space as with a Deity who merely dwells everywhere, since for all such purposes this would be the same as nowhere" (p. 436), can only gain by not allowing his philosophy to crop out.

Again, what the author says of "Genesis and geology" shows not only a want of metaphysical training, but an absence of necessary exegetical information. "Any attempt," says Dr. Miller, "to construe the first and second chapters of Genesis upon the principles of modern geology, especially in connection with the nebular hypothesis, must necessarily result, in my view, in really forced if not fanciful constructions of both theories, and absolutely in a downright injustice to the Mosaic system" (p. 422). There are certainly eminent men in both theology and geology who are of opinion that a harmony between the Mosaic cosmogony and the "nebular hypothesis" is not only possible, but that the former has even gained additional clearness from the latter. In his development of this point, the Doctor constantly confuses the first and the second creation, *i.e.*, the creation "ex nihilo" and the process of division.

The logical powers of Dr. Miller may be illustrated by the following process of reasoning: "When it is found that the Acadian character whose usual reading is Ni had the meaning of hearth, altar, God, this is sufficient to demonstrate that the God Ni was the hearth-divinity of the Acadian or Cushite race. . . . It is now known that the Etrusco-Roman civilization was derived, in a great measure, from the valley of the Euphrates. Thus it is probable that we may find in the Roman cultus of the Penates and Lares of the Latin nation a reflex of the religious conceptions and customs centring in the primitive Cushite god of the hearth. . . . (Here follow extracts from Smith's "Classical Dictionary," art. Penates; Bernard, "Dic. Myth.," art. Penates; and Mr. H. S. Maine's "Ancient Law," pp. 123, 124.) . . . But the most important fact of all is, that the Acadian or Cushite God Ni was one and the same personage with Yahveh, or Jehovah, of the Old Testament. . . . The result is, from the data that have been now submitted, that the national God of the Jews was originally one with the ancient Acadian or Cushite divinity of the hearth." The logical weakness of the first and second statements is clear to any one who will take the trouble to

express the same in strictly dialectic form. Dr. Miller himself perceives what far-reaching inferences may be drawn from the identity of Ni with Jehovah. Hence he first adds in an apologetic manner: "The fact thus brought out to light is of very great importance, though it will be received with some hesitancy among Biblical scholars." Then he goes on to protest against one or another odious inference derived from his premises: "It would be quite illegitimate to infer, from the assimilation here established, that the Jehovah of the Old Testament was originally regarded as a divinity of inferior rank, like some of the house-gods of antiquity. . . ." (pp. 34, ff.).

Having considered Dr. Miller's work from a metaphysical, logical and exegetical point of view, we may add a few of the results which the author draws from his investigations: 1. The cradle of humanity was the great plateau of Panir, situated on the high tablelands of Central Asia, near the point where the mountains of the Belurtag unite themselves to the Himalayas (p. 171). We may be allowed to remark that in the author's argument no notice is taken of the flood, or of the question whether it was universal or partial. If a universal flood be admitted by Dr. Miller, his arguments only prove that Noah's Ark remained in the locality indicated, or that the patriarch himself settled there.

2. We are able to attach to the historic development of mankind a definite chronological value, an antiquity of 12,500 years. The data from which this result is derived may be reduced to three: At the time of the world's and man's creation the sign Capricorn was in the constellation Gemini, at the winter-solstice; the sign Taurus was in the constellation Libra, at the vernal equinox; the star Vega, in the constellation Lyra, was the celestial pole, marking the Eden of the North. But "the chronology which results from this, as the practical astronomer will perceive at once, is, in round numbers, 12,500 years from the present time." In order to see the force of this method of reasoning, we must keep in mind Dr. Miller's view that the primitive revelation is written in the heavens. Thus the Gemini represent the two first men; near Vega are the woman and the serpent, marking the temptation and the fall; there too is Hercules quite close to the serpent, recalling the words "it shall crush thy head." However ingeniously the single links of the argument may have been developed, it must always seem very arbitrary to a sober critic.

3. Though we admire Dr. Miller's piety in representing Our Lord as the fulfilment of the entire circle of traditionary hopes, we are rather shocked at what appears to us a pure twisting of the New Testament terminology relating to Christ so as to bring it into conformity with the mythological terminology of the ancient nations. . . . The student will, however, find in Dr. Miller's work a valuable collection of traditionary and mythological literature concerning the great subjects of primitive revelation, and man's relation to the earth as well as the starry heavens. And since the author has given us so much precious information on these subjects, we have no blame, but only pity for him because he has not succeeded better in the fields of philosophy and theology.

R. P. BERNARDINI A. PICONIO Ord. Cap. Concionatoris . . . *Triplex Expositio Beati Pauli Apostoli Epistole Ad Romanos* . . . emendata et aucta per P. Michaellem Hetsenauer, Ord. Cap. Oeniponte, 1891. Typis et Sumptibus Societatis Marianæ.

If a professor of Sacred Scripture should be asked, "Which is the most serviceable explanation of the Epistles of St. Paul as yet written?" we think that he would unhesitatingly answer, "The *Triplex Expositio* of Piconius."

Since its first publication at Paris in 1703, by Jean Anisson, director of the Royal Printing House, innumerable editions have issued from the press of almost every country of Europe. In 1707 Pope Clement XI. congratulated the author on his admirable work, and encouraged him to write a triplex expositio of the gospels. Not to quote old authorities as to its value, we shall mention a few well-known modern scriptural professors. Cornely, S. J., in his *introductio spec.*, says: "The Triplex Expositio of Bernardinus a Piconio is to be praised for its conciseness, clearness and unction, and will please, even in our day, all those who cannot give much time to Scriptural studies." Ubaldi, who was professor of Sacred Scripture in the Propaganda, and also in the Pope's own seminary, writes: "Bernardinus a Piconio has written commentaries on the gospels and the Pauline epistles, the latter by far the more celebrated work. In this work the pious and learned author has omitted nothing that could help to a proper understanding of the text and the advantage of the reader. For these reasons this work was honored with special praise by Clement XI., and is wont to be preferred to other commentaries of the Pauline epistles by students of Sacred Scripture who, as is just, desire to join Biblical knowledge with piety."

No higher praise can be bestowed than this. Bernardinus was born in Picquigny, in Picardy, in 1633, hence his name, a Piconio, or simply "Piconius." He joined the Capuchin branch of the Franciscan Order of the province of Paris, and, having received the priesthood, was appointed lector or professor of theology. He filled all the important offices within the gift of his Order up to that of the first *Definitor* to the Father Provincial. The Epistles of St. Paul were his constant study and delight; that apostle, his special patron. Free at last from all other cares, he devoted all his time and study to the composition of this wonderful threefold exposition of the epistles of St. Paul. The piety and unction, not to speak of the deep learning displayed in this *opus aureum*, are shown in the beautiful prayer with which he inaugurated his book: "By Thy grace, freed from all else, this one thing I ask of Thee, O God, the Truth and Love. I desire to begin on earth that happy life of mind and heart which, trusting in Thy infinite mercy, I hope to lead for all eternity in heaven. There Thou wilt be the life of my mind, when I shall see Thee clearly, O Supreme Truth; there Thou wilt be the complete life of my heart, when I shall love Thee with all my heart. O God, Eternal Love, when, then, I shall come and appear before Thy face! O God, supreme happiness of mind and heart, when I shall see Thee face to face; when I shall love Thee with entire fullness of my heart; when united, adhering to Thee with all my soul, transformed entirely in Thee, wholly taken up and absorbed in the abyss of Thy divinity, one spirit with Thee, blessed with Thy life, I shall live with Thy blessedness!

"*This is life everlasting.* Meanwhile, O God, my whole good and the centre of all good, by Thy grace I understand that to adhere to Thee by faith and charity and to place all my hope in Thee alone, my Lord and my God, is my good and all my good; this is life, this is glory, riches, blessedness, this is all good. By Thy grace willingly and joyfully, therefore, do I choose this sacred and divine adhesion, henceforth to be occupied with Thee alone by constant prayer and by the continual meditation of Thy word, which is, as it were, the radius of Thy eternal truth and a spark of Thy divine love, and, therefore, the beginning of the life of mind and heart; for truth is the life of the mind, and love, the life of the heart. O God, confirm this which Thou hast wrought in me. Help me, O God, my salvation,

and for the glory of Thy name, uphold me by Thy grace, free from all obstacles in this sacred rest, which is also great labor. I shall live henceforth always entirely for Thee alone. That this may come to pass, let Thy face shine upon me, and have pity on me, O God, the Truth! In flame my heart and reins, O Divine Charity! May I be enlightened by Thee! May I glow by Thee. May I be nourished with the truth of Thy speech here, until I see Thee, the Truth itself, and seeing, be nourished by Thee. May I burn with the fires of Thy speech here, until by everlasting charity I enjoy Thee, and by beatific love transformed into Thee, I may live by Thee and in Thee. Be Thou my life on earth through the illumination and warmth of Thy word until Thou be my eternal and blessed life in heaven through Thy essence, which is truth and charity."

This is the unction which pervades the whole of the *Triplex Expositio*, and which, joined to the deep knowledge of the pious author, makes his work so precious.

As is well known, Piconius begins each chapter by giving an analysis of its contents, the order and development of the argument; he then gives a paraphrase of the text, and lastly a commentary on each verse. His new editor adds to each chapter his own dogmatic, moral, ascetic and pastoral notes, especially for the use of preachers. With Maldonatus and Luzerne on the Gospels and Piconius on the Epistles of St. Paul, the preacher has all he needs for his sermons, and we say emphatically that he could not go to better authorities. Every priest should have a copy of Piconius in his library, and we would recommend this last edition of Father Hetzenauer, because it gives not only the best reading of the Vulgate Latin text, but also the best Greek text, and in the commentary he has utilized whatsoever the progress in biblical studies has shown should be corrected or added to the explanation of his devout author.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER "PSALLIRET WEISE!"—Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie von Dr. Maurus Wolter, O.S.B. Erzabt von St. Martin zu Beuron, Zweite Auflage, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder'sche Verlagshundlung, 1891. B. Herder, St. Louis. 2 vols., \$2.75 a vol.

In looking over these two grand volumes on the Psalms, the thought came naturally to our minds: why is it that we have nothing at all of the kind in the English language? Bellarmine's "Explanation" has been translated into English, but it is long since out of print, is excessively rare, and considering the wonderful progress made in critical Biblical studies during this century, especially as regards the Psalms, would itself demand manifold explanation. Even in the time of Calmet, the number of commentators on the Psalms as set down by him, had risen to a thousand. Since his day, particularly in Germany, the Psalms have been a favorite study. Our author tells us that he has made use of both old and new commentators but especially of Thalhoffer, Schegg and Delitzsch.

His title gives the object of his work: Psallite Sapienter! Know what you are singing, penetrate the inner holiness of the Psalms, their rich meaning, their mystical depths. His object is not merely to give a critical, scientific explanation of the meaning of those wonderful poets of heavenly song, although that investigation must necessarily constitute the firm foundation of his work. His object is rather, he says, to listen to the heavenly music of the Psalms as it came from heaven and welled up from the hearts of the singers, to seek out the longings of the Holy Spirit, now whispering softly, now roaring like the storm.

Man's highest duty is prayer to his Creator, the worship of God. In it the soul rises to its highest dignity. Its loftiest conceptions are expressed in song. In his religious worship Moses was a poet. So also in the days of Samuel, the high priest and judge, we find the choirs praising God in song. Then came David, who gave to the worship of the Lord its perfection and complete organization. He selected four thousand singers and placed over them Asaph, Ethan and Eman as leaders, with 288 others of the Levites, reserving to himself the supreme direction. He gave them for their song-book the Psalter, begun by himself and completed by the heavenly-inspired poets—holy music, which has passed from the Old to the New Law—holy song, which was accompanied by various musical instruments, according to the seasons and festivals of the year.

Our Divine Lord set His own seal of confirmation on these blessed hymns of the Old Law. His lips uttered them from his tenderest years even to his last sigh on the cross. The Psalter is not only a holy book of songs, but also a canon of Messianic prophecies, illustrated and fulfilled in the life of Jesus Christ. Is it any wonder then, that through Jesus, the Psalter became even dearer and holier to the Apostles, than it had been before? (Col. iii., 16; Eph. v., 18.) The Psalms are quoted nearly one hundred times in the New Testament. The Apostolic Church introduced them at once into the Liturgy. Even the children committed them to memory and all the congregation joined in the sacred song at the Introit of the Mass, the Gradual, the Offertory and Post Communion.

The old "Itala" version, which was a translation from the Septuagint, was the translation of the Psalms used by all, and it is the only part of the Sacred Scriptures which could not be changed in the Vulgate edition, so opposed were all the people to any alteration in the sacred song they had so long been accustomed to. We need not dwell on the Hebrew text of the Psalms we now have and which is that of the Masoretic rabbis of the seventh century; nor shall we speak of the Septuagint version which follows closely the Hebrew text extant in the days of the Ptolemies, long before the advent of Jesus Christ. The old "Itala" version is a literal translation of the Septuagint and was twice reviewed and corrected according to the original Greek by St. Jerome. This great Doctor's translation made from the original Hebrew, although, by far the best version extant, was not incorporated into his Vulgate edition, for the reason we have given.

The order in which the Psalms are given is that established in the times of Esdras and Nehemias. About ninety of them were composed by King David; the others by Moses, Solomon, by the sons of Core, Asaph, Ethan and Eman and other unknown writers. Their division into *five* books, or the Pentateuch, corresponding to the five books of Moses, is very ancient: that division depends on the Doxology which is found at the end of the 50th, 71st, 88th, 105th, and 150th Psalm.

Our author had published the first volume of this work as far back as 1869. He was still engaged with the second volume when on the 8th of July, 1890, he was called to his eternal reward. He had revised the first half of the second volume at the time of his death. Should the reader desire to form a good idea of the value of this treasure-house, we would refer him to the author's Commentaries on the Messianic Psalms, viz., Psalms 2, 15, 21, 44, 71, 109, but especially to Psalm 21, the Psalm Jesus Himself recited as His own dying song, "*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*" David's prophecy of the Passion of our Divine Lord.

In conclusion we can only express again the ardent desire that we may soon have an English translation of some such commentary as this of Dr. Wolter on the Psalms.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE ROMAN QUESTION. By *Monsignor Schroeder, D.D., Ph.D.* New York: Benziger Brothers, 1892.

Mgr. Schroeder's article on the Temporal Power of the Supreme Pontiff which appeared in our last number was universally recognized, not only in America but also in Europe, as so timely and masterful that we rejoice to greet it once more in its present expanded and more durable shape. The first duty of a sincere Catholic is enthusiastic loyalty to the Vicar of Christ, and that the American Catholics, lay and cleric, are foremost in their allegiance to their spiritual chieftain has been proved by demonstration time and again; never more brilliantly than when the news arrived of the sacrilegious invasion of the Holy City by the hordes of Victor Emmanuel on September 20, 1870. In no part of Christendom did the clamor of indignation rise more loudly or uncompromisingly than in this free republic. Nor has that sentiment been modified or blunted by time. The colossal wrong is not condoned by the Catholics of America. *Aeternum volvunt sub pectore vulnus.* But why keep it *sub pectore*? Why not give open expression to their feelings? They *have* done so with firmness and dignity on every favorable occasion. Sympathy with the Holy Father; indignant protests against each successive outrage inflicted upon him; the assurance that his children in America are determined to aid him with voice and money have time and again been wafted over the Atlantic. Let us not be tempted to imagine that the outspoken words of a great and free people fall unheeded. They carry encouragement to the august old Prisoner in the Vatican and dismay into the ranks of his foes. In this question, as in many others, the position of Holy Church is much stronger than it might seem to a superficial observer to be. Brute physical force may bluster; but moral force is on every occasion the ultimate victor. It is the fundamental principle of Christianity that Providence overrules all. How the drama which is acting before our eyes will end, we leave to Providence to work out. As far as human agency can bring things to a satisfactory conclusion, it is the prerogative of the Pope to give directions. It is his affair first of all; whilst we are attending to our special duties, he is constantly and intently watching the signs in the heavens and taking advantage of circumstances as they rise. To undertake to give him advice, resembles the absurdity of boys and school-mistresses during the late war who thought they knew better when to advance and retire than the generals in the field. We do not just now remember that any true Catholic in America has weakened on the question of the Temporal Power, but we are very certain that if any one should raise his voice to advocate unworthy compromises, he would receive speedy punishment in the universal condemnation of the Catholic body. It is not expected of us that we do more than hold fast to our present position. We are not called on to "resist unto blood;" the Supreme Pontiff asks only for sympathy. Backed by the moral support of his loyal children, he, the conqueror of Barbarossas and Bonapartes, will again issue triumphant from his trials. "Usurping Italy," says Mgr. Schroeder, "does not fear anything so much as this manifestation of Catholic sentiment. It is on this account that she has interfered at home with the petitions which were being drawn up in favor of the Pope. . . . Italy will not be able long to resist such a pressure from the public conscience, and

must finally decide herself to make up her mind to pay her 'international debt.' The unanimous expression of a sentiment so just, so noble, and so legitimate, will be considered everywhere as the voice of Eternal Justice, whose echo resounds in the hearts of the believers of the Old World and of the New."

Dr. Schroeder also remarks with truth that attachment to the Holy See is not the distinguishing badge of any race or tongue amongst American Catholics. Regardless of extraction, we are thoroughly at one upon this subject. If we have not all protested with equal loudness or frequency, this has been owing solely to the fact that all of us have not equal faith in the efficiency of mass meetings and Congresses. Some of us have an instinctive dread of public assemblages gathered for religious purposes. But since the "Spirit of the age" clamors for meetings and conventions, let us have them by all means and patiently tolerate incidental inconveniences in view of their prospective benefits.

JESUS CHRIST; OUR SAVIOUR'S PERSON, MISSION AND SPIRIT. From the French of the *Rev. Father Didon, O. P.* Edited by *Right Reverend Bernard O'Reilly, D.D., D.Lit.* (Laval). With an Introduction by His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. With many illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1891.

The fact that this new Life of Christ, by Père Didon, within a few months of its publication in the original French reached its twentieth edition, is sufficient evidence of the estimate placed upon it by French reading Catholics. That it will be held in like high esteem by English reading Catholics we have not the slightest doubt. At first thought it may seem strange that now-a-days almost countless Lives of Christ are composed and published; and, this too, not only by Christians, real or nominal, but also by avowed skeptics and infidels of every school and phase of thought. Yet in reality it is not at all strange. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the central personage in all human history. With His nativity ancient history ends and modern history begins. All the predictions and prophecies, all the faiths and beliefs, all the myths and legends, all the desires and hopes and expectations, lucid and consistent or obscure and confused, of all nations that existed before Him, intelligent or ignorant, refined and cultured, or barbarous and savage, alike look forward to His coming into the world. From His coming into the world, and by his coming, were determined the fate and destiny of all pre-existing nations, and also the whole subsequent course of history. Eliminate Him, ignore Him, and *all* history, both *before* and *afterwards*, becomes a riddle without any intelligent explanation; a mere chronicle of events, political, military, intellectual, religious, without any sufficient, intelligible cause or connection.

Hence it is, that avowed skeptics and infidels, that rationalists and heretics, as well as truly devout believers in Christ, have felt themselves *compelled* to undertake to write *His Life*. All alike *must* do it—these to give a reason for their faith, those to endeavor to palliate and excuse their disbelief.

Evidently, this thought was in the mind of the distinguished Dominican, the eminently learned and devout Père Didon. Turning away from brilliant prospects of winning renown as an eloquent preacher, he buried himself for years in the houses of his Order in Corsica and Paris, devoting himself, heart and soul, to meditating on the Life of his

Divine Master. He spent two years in Germany, studying Christian Apologetics, and all the systems of anti-Christian criticism. He made two journeys to the Holy Land, traversing it repeatedly in every direction, visiting and revisiting every locality mentioned in the Gospels, noting all their surroundings, and, with his artistic genius, taking in and indelibly impressing on his memory every feature of the landscapes, while tracing and retracing, step by step, our Divine Lord and Saviour's journeys in Galilee, Judæa, and Samaria—lovingly and devoutly lingering longest where He longest tarried.

Thus prepared and equipped by long and careful study of all the branches of knowledge bearing on his proposed undertaking, by minute and painstaking investigation, by devout reflection and meditation, Père Didon wrote this Life of Christ. He has written for the reading masses; yet his book meets the demands of criticism.

It is an admirable work; written in simple and dignified style, befitting the majesty of its subject; it depicts our Blessed Redeemer in the two-fold light of His Humanity and Divinity, in the scenes and surroundings, in the midst of which He lived and amongst the people whom he labored to enlighten and convert. While strictly preserving the form of a simple narrative of what our Divine Lord said and did, it conclusively refutes the sophistical objections of rationalists and infidels, showing that our Blessed Redeemer was not a mythical personage, nor one whom, though a real historical person, His followers unduly eulogized and exalted after his death, but that the Gospels are authentic and perfectly truthful statements of what their respective authors, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, have recorded of the sayings and doings of Christ our Divine Lord.

The typographical execution of the work well comports with the value of the contents.

LOYOLA AND THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE JESUITS. By the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

To those who, like ourselves, cannot command the leisure necessary to peruse the ponderous tomes in which Father Pachtler has expounded the Jesuit system of education in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Pædagogica* this able essay of Father Hughes will come as a grateful substitute. We congratulate the Scribners upon their fairness and large-mindedness in calling upon a Jesuit to contribute this brief analysis of the educational history and methods of the greatest of teaching corporations to the series of *The Great Educators*. The old-fashioned way was to commit such a task to some writer whose chief recommendation would be an intense hatred of the Company of Jesus, and whose lucubration would be only a rehash of exploded calumnies.

The first and bitterest enemies of the new society instituted by St. Ignatius were the Universities, whose usefulness had departed and whose ire arose from seeing their work superseded by their new rival. The Universities could *teach* but could not *educate*. The Jesuit system aimed at training each individual youth not only in intellectuals but also and chiefly in good morals. The students at the Universities were disorganized mobs; the students at the new Jesuit colleges were thoroughly organized armies. In the conflict it was easy to foresee which party would carry off the palm of victory, if there were any virtue in the principle of the survival of the fittest. The most earnest and efficient professors and scholars joined the ranks of the Jesuits; the others vented

their impotent rage at beholding the decreasing popularity of their institutions, by calumnies and revilings, many of which still survive by force of tradition.

After a rapid sketch of the educational history of his Order Father Hughes devotes the second part of his essay to a critical analysis of the *Ratio Studiorum*, or system of studies, which was the outcome and crystallization of forty years' actual experience in the schoolroom. It will surprise many of his readers to find that pedagogic science is not so recent as one might suppose from the incessant boasting which fills the air. The Loyolan system of education had little to learn from more modern efforts in the way of arrangement of courses and grades, and has been unsurpassed for thoroughness in details. The fundamental principle inculcated by St. Ignatius to attend to one thing at a time and not pass on till that be mastered brought forth generations of solidly learned men; the method at present in vogue amongst us of cramming an immense quantity of all sorts of intellectual food into the undeveloped minds of children is raising up around us a generation of superficial parrots who have not even the merit of knowing that there are thousands of things they have no conception of. At a time when so much attention is being devoted to the improvement of educational methods it is well for Catholic educators to take an inventory of their own resources. St. Ignatius was as truly a vessel of election for the educator of Christian youth as St. Thomas was for students of divinity. Let us improve and expand his method in the light of new developments, but let us build upon our own foundations, taking out of our treasures new things and old.

CHRISTIANITY OR INFALLIBILITY. BOTH OR NEITHER. By the Rev. Daniel Lyons. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

The subject of this work forms one of—indeed it is not too much to say that it forms—the crucial question of our age, and not only of our age, but of all ages. For if our Blessed Redeemer did not so constitute His Church that by virtue of His continual assistance, her Visible Head and Sovereign Pontiff ever has been, is and ever will be preserved from all possibility of erring in teaching all things that He has commanded, then is the Christian religion a falsehood and the Christian faith a delusion. The Reverend author of the work before us has clearly stated this alternative in his preface.

“To believe,” he says, in a supernatural revelation, and in a living, infallible Witness, Guardian and Interpreter of the same, is most reasonable; but to believe in the one and to reject the other is logically indefensible. For what reasonable grounds can such a man have for his belief in the specific truths of said revelation? How can he determine, with the certainty which divine faith presupposes and demands, what those truths are in detail, and what is their genuine meaning? To the truth-seeker, therefore, as well as to the Christian believer, who wishes to have an adequate reason for his faith, the question of Infallibility is of the first and most pressing importance. Indeed, it may be said to be the only question; for the doctrine of Infallibility goes to the very root of the Christian controversy, and supplies the only complete and thoroughly satisfactory solution of the many and grave difficulties which it involves. . . . Complex as the controversy may appear, after all, when analyzed, it presents but this single issue, viz., did God appoint for all time a living, infallible Witness, Guardian and Interpreter of His revelation.

With the proof and explanation of this *fact*—the infallibility of the

Church—the volume before us is wholly occupied. In its first chapter the author states the dogma of Papal Infallibility, shows what it really means, and exposes the almost countless misrepresentations of its meaning by those who deny it. In the two next chapters he states the reasons “Why Catholics Believe in the Dogma of Infallibility.” In the two following chapters he shows “How Catholics Meet the Objections to Infallibility.” Three appendices are then respectively occupied with showing “The Happiness of Converts” (owing to the certitude of their faith), with a statement of “Some Facts Relating to the Vatican Council,” and “Pontifical Decrees and the Obedience Due to Them.” Following each chapter are numerous notes, citing the different works the author has consulted.

We regard the volume as a very valuable addition to our Catholic literature. It ought to be in the possession of every intelligent Catholic layman.

THE MEMOIRS OF RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN, M.D., F.R.C.S. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

Dr. Madden was born in Ireland in the year 1798, and he died in his native land in the year 1886. He was a successful physician, an untiring philanthropist, a voluminous writer, an extensive traveller, and a loyal Irishman. One who knew him well has said of him:

“Few men have seen so much of the world, mingled in so many stirring scenes, or with persons of greater eminence, or accomplished a larger share of useful and permanent work than that brave old man, whose talents are attested in each and all of his forty published volumes; and whose life is well worthy of being chronicled, not only on account of its almost romantic character, but also because of his eminence as a *litterateur*, and his achievements as a philanthropist.”

Dr. Madden left abundant material for this Memoir, and it is to a great extent autobiographical. His son Thomas More Madden, M.D., has used the material to advantage, and we have the result in a neat 12mo. volume of 325 pages filled with delightful stories of adventure and travel, and narrating the personal reminiscences of an observant man, who visited all parts of the world, and met most of the distinguished people of his time. His career was indeed varied. In one chapter we read of his experience in the hands of Bedouin robbers in Palestine, in another we find him prescribing for a distinguished Turk, and in a third he tells us of his meeting with President Jackson whom he found sitting on the verandah of the White House smoking a short meerschaum pipe.

Now he stands before the pyramids of Egypt, and addresses them in poetic measures, and again he gazes upon the Falls of Niagara which he speaks of as the grandest sight in the world. It would not be safe to travel with the doctor's memoirs as a guide book. He says that Albany is sixty miles from Philadelphia. Perhaps they travelled by some unknown short road in those days.

Throughout his long life he wrote a great deal of poetry; some good, some tolerable, and some bad. One of the best pieces in the book is an ode to the King of Terrors (death), which he wrote in Rome when very sick. This was in early life on the occasion of his first visit to the Eternal City, which he entered penniless, after a walk of thirty-nine miles, and after spending seventeen hours on the road without rest or food. A poem addressed to death on such an occasion ought to be realistic. Many of the doctor's poems are very like those of John S. Saxe, and they will not add to his literary reputation.

But it is hardly fair to find fault where there is so much to praise. A book of this kind gives to us an opportunity to visit scenes far distant and changed, and to meet persons illustrious when living, but now numbered with the illustrious dead. It teaches us how to do good and how to avoid evil, and therefore it is an entertaining, instructive book which may be heartily recommended.

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. T. Gilmartin, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Vol. II. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; London: Burns & Oates. 1892.

In our review of the first volume of this excellent work we explained its purpose and plan, viz.: that it purposed to be "a class-book for ecclesiastical students who have to read a course of Church History in a comparatively short time." What we said of that first volume, we here repeat, and with emphasis, of the second. "That the Rev. author has more than fulfilled his word. That he has given us a most excellent summary of Church history—a summary useful not only to ecclesiastical students who have to take a short course, but useful also to the crowd of 'college' men who are supposed to absorb a sufficient knowledge of Church history without any course whatever."

As in the former volume, so in the present one, the author's style is clear and simple. Carrying out his excellent system of marginal notes, he offers the student most admirable assistance and suggestions of the utmost value. Beginning, in the present volume, with the pontificate of Gregory VII., he conducts us step by step, with clearest vision and safest judgment, through the splendid reign of that great pontiff, through the great controversy on investiture, through the pontificate of Innocent III., through the struggle between the Papacy and the Hohenstaufens, through the history of the crusades, the rise of religious orders, scholasticism, mysticism, inquisition and schism, down to the sixteenth century. We especially like his chapters on the inquisitions (Roman and Spanish) and the Great Schism of the West. Treating of the inquisitions he is fair and honest, concealing nothing, shirking nothing. This period of his history will, we are sure, meet with general approval. Equally honest and sound is he in his treatment of the Great Schism of the West. Taking it all in all, it is many a day since we have had the pleasure of reading a work so generally and so eminently satisfactory and trustworthy. It is most creditable to the high ability of its author, an honor to old Maynooth, and will assuredly do much for the glory of the Church.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Father Matteo Liberatore, S. J.* Translated by Edward Heveage DeKing. London: Art and Book Company. New York: Benziger & Co. 1891.

This was the last work of the great Jesuit philosopher, Liberatore, written for young men when he was eighty years old. He began to teach philosophy in 1834 and wrote this volume in 1888. His object was to enunciate the Catholic principles which must be the foundation of all true science, and so also of Political Economy. He tells us in his preface that his reason for writing it was "that our young men, not only laymen, but clerics also, had need of initiation in economic science, because it is interwoven with almost all the affairs of civil life; whilst I found no course of instruction fitted to be a safe guide for them. My intention, therefore, was to prepare something like a compendium of sound principles, that would suffice to put young men on the right road

along which they might proceed safely." After an introduction on Political Economy as an art and a science, and its subordination to Political and Moral Science, he divides his work into three parts, viz., Production, Distribution and Consumption, with an Appendix on Workmen's Associations. Coming out, as it does now in an English dress, so soon after the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the Condition of the Laboring Class, it will be particularly welcome to all, but especially to college students. We are sure it will be immediately introduced as a text-book. It could have no better guarantee than the name of Liberatore who has ever been a faithful student and disciple of the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO SOCIETY. Theological Essays. By *Edmund J. O'Reilley, S. J.* (sometime Professor of Theology in Maynooth College at St. Bruno's, in North Wales, and in the Catholic University of Ireland). Edited, with a Biographical Notice, by Matthew Russell, S. J. John Hodges: Agar Street, Charing Cross, London. 1892.

Of the eminent ability of Father O'Reilley to lucidly and thoroughly discuss the important subjects comprised in his work, the high estimation in which he was held by Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Cullen, the Right Rev. Dr. Brown, Bishop of Shrewsbury, the Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, Bishop of Ferns, the present Archbishop of Dublin, and by the late Father Beckx, General of the Society of Jesus, and by other distinguished Prelates in Ireland and England, sufficiently attest.

Suffice it to say, that the volume before us comprises learned and thoughtful essays upon "Revelation and the Natural Law," "The Nature of the Catholic Church," "The Pastoral Office of the Catholic Church," "The Infallibility of the Catholic Church," "The Church's Legislation," "The Church's Executive Power," "The Clergy," "Education," "Church Property," "The Teaching of the Church," "Papal Infallibility," "The Obedience Due to the Pope," "Liberty of Conscience," "The Council of Constance," "Marriage," "The Church and Politics," "The Pope's Temporal Power."

As we have already said, the essays on these and collateral subjects are learned, thoughtful, and instructive.

THE SONGS OF SAPPHO. By *James L. Easby-Smith*. Published for Georgetown University. Washington, D. C.: Stormont & Jackson. 1891.

A little gem, we are sure, every literary man capable of judging will pronounce this book. Together with a brief memoir of Sappho it gives us in smooth, flowing verse a translation of the odes and most of the fragments of that wondrous singer. The work was done, the author tells us, during his year as Senior at Georgetown University. Both to himself and his Alma Mater it is highly creditable. The work is doubly precious from the fact that, together with the translation the author has given us the odes and fragments in the original Greek—giving first, the original and then the translation. It will, we are sure, commend itself to the attention and command the respect of all lovers of beautiful thought.

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By the *Rev. Daniel O'Loan*, Dean of Maynooth College. Nassau Street, Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Printers and Publishers. 1891.

This is an excellent ceremonial. We greatly like its arrangement.

We like it moreover for the system of marginal notes running all through the work. We think, however, that it would have been an improvement if the author had arranged the functions of the various participants in the ceremonies under distinct and separate headings or articles. This, however, may be but a matter of taste and in no material way detracts from the value of the work. The book is in every way a credit to the publishers. We wish it the largest measure of success.

THE WISDOM AND WIT OF BLESSED THOMAS MORE. Being Extracts from such of his Works as were written in English. Collected and edited by *Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C. S.S. R.*

This work is entirely independent of the *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More*, by the same author, and may be regarded as supplementing it.

After a very interesting and valuable introduction the author arranges his selections into five chapters or parts respectively, entitled: Ascetic, Dogmatic, Illustrative of the Period; Fancies, Sports and Merry Tales, Colloquial and Quaint Phrases.

The title of the work, "Wit and Wisdom," well comports with the character of its contents. It would be hard to find another such collection of true wisdom and keen, pungent, yet gentle wit and humor as this volume contains.

RITUALE ROMANUM, PAULI V. Pontificis maximi jussu editum. Et a *Benedicto XIV*, auctum et castigatum. Cui novissima accessit benedictionum et instructionum appendix. Editio tertia post typicam Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati. Sumptis Chartis et typis Congregationis Typographi.

We welcome the newest edition of Pustet's well known Ritual. Of course, as was to be expected, the book gives us little or nothing that is new in the way of information. In regard to matter all Rituals are, for the most part, alike, but as to order and arrangement they are oftentimes widely different. And it is in this regard that we consider Pustet's Ritual the superior of any now in use.

We therefore cheerfully recommend it.

MARY, QUEEN OF MAY; AND OTHER "AVE MARIA" ESSAYS. By *Brother Azarias*, of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The "Ave Maria:" Notre Dame, Indiana.

This little volume comprises three short essays respectively entitled, "Mary, Queen of May," "Mary and the Faithful Departed," and "Mary in Heaven." They briefly but lucidly state and explain the relations of Mary with the faithful on Earth, with the souls in Purgatory, and with the saints in Heaven. The work is a gem. Every paragraph is pregnant with thought beautifully expressed while the animating spirit of the whole is that of the profoundest love and devotion to the holy Mother of God.

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE PRACTICES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By *Rev. J. J. Burke*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This little work is intended as a companion and sequel to another work by the same author, on "The Reasonableness of the Ceremonies of

the Catholic Church." Its principal object is to explain to persons unable to procure larger and more expensive works, the meaning and purpose of the practices of the Church. In this the Rev. author has been very successful.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM. Auctore Clarissimo P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F., novis curis edidit P. F. Irenaeus Bierbaum, O. S. F. Volumen Secundum, Pars V., De Dominio atque Ve Contractibus; Pars VI., De Restitutione Puderbonæ, 1891. Ex Typographia Bonifaciana. Benziger Bros. New York.

In our January number we called attention to the first four parts of this new edition of Elbel's Moral Theology and the special claims it had for the theological student and the clergy. Any of the old editions are rarely met with; therefore this new edition ought to be welcomed by all students and should find a place alongside of Lehmkuhl, Koenigs and Sabetti in a priest's library.

THIRTY-TWO INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY AND FOR THE FEAST OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. From the French by Rev. Thomas F. Ward. New York: Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

These are truly admirable instructions; eminently practical; entirely free from false sentimentalism and animated with a spirit of fervent piety.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE TRIAL OF MARGARET BRERETON. By *Pleydell North*, author of "M. le Cure," "Russian Violets," etc., etc.

PHILIP; OR, THE MOLLIE'S SECRET. A Tale of the Coal Regions. By *Patrick Justin McMahon*. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

SAN SALVADOR. By *Agnes Tincker*, author of "Signor Monaldini's Niece," "Two Coronets," etc. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1892.

ONE HUNDRED THESES ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE. By *Merwin-Marie Snell*. Washington, D. C. Published by the author. 1892.

CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY. By *Rev. John Thein*, with an Introduction by Prof. Chas. Herbermann, Ph. D., LL.D. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

THE GLORIES OF DIVINE GRACE. A Free Rendering of the Original Treatise of P. Eusebius Nieremberg, S. J. By *Dr. M. Jos. Scheeben*. Second Edition. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—JULY, 1892.—No. 67.

MATTER AND FORM IN BIOLOGY.

I.

THE human mind seeks for causes. To the student it is an absolute necessity, if his work deserves to be called study. Of this the vagaries of modern philosophy afford ample proof. It is true, that nearly all non-Catholics will sneer at an exemplar cause; will affect indifference to the final cause; that some will presume to question any First Cause; that most have not the slightest idea what material and formal causes may be; but all men who have not fallen to think only of phenomena have an interest in the efficient cause. The child asks what makes the grass grow, and just now men of science are asking what may be the immediate cause of the shape of organisms, either considered as units or as the sum of many parts, to each of which the same question applies. Why is the leaf of the maple five-pointed? What makes the serrated border of that of the elm? Why do we have five fingers and toes, and by what agencies are the ends of our hands and feet thus split up? Some would reply, that these are the effects of mechanical causes, not yet fully explained, by which growth is checked in certain parts and in others increased. Some, the so-called vitalists, would refer it to a vital force, which, acting from without on the organism, as do mechanical and chemical agents, has the property of bringing it into its proper shape. According to Scholastic philosophy, the form determines the structure, not, however, as an external force, but according to its nature as the life-giving agent to the matter of which the organism is composed. The very cells are not inert particles to be squeezed together or drawn out by

forces outside of them. Each lives and grows, not, however, as an independent individual, but as a part of the whole. Undoubtedly, the shape of each is dependent on the action of its neighbors. They may be pushed and pulled without injury, provided that the pushing and pulling are conducive to the arrangement that is characteristic of the parts they go to make in the organism. The form directs the development, but it makes use of the ordinary physical forces, chemical and mechanical. It is not impossible that the last clause may not always have been kept enough in sight, and the whole ascribed to the form. Such an answer is no longer (if it ever were) satisfactory. We want to know more. Those who admit the directing principle, still ask how it acts. Do purely mechanical forces take part in the process, and if so, to what extent?

Precisely what is meant by the mechanical system or theory, just now so much in fashion, is not quite so clear as could be wished. The underlying idea seems to be a protest against anything that is not mechanical, any vital principle, and, probably, any act of creation. Carried to its extent, it makes even reason and will the results of physical processes. It is not our province to expose the absurdity of such a system. We confine our discussion to the growth of organisms. Even in this narrower field the same want of clearness reigns. Some authors see only the work of mechanical forces. Others dwell on the wonderful adaptation of means to ends, showing, for instance, how admirable is the mechanism of the structures for support and motion, and in how close accord with the laws of physics. The height of their ambition appears to be to express this in mathematical formulæ. They see no evidence of design. If they do not say that the cause is mechanical, they put it aside altogether, concentrating their attention on the result. The mechanical system proper belongs to the former; the latter, though classed among its followers, can hardly be said to have a system at all. The real conflict is between the Scholastic system and Monism. Vitalism may be put aside. There is no evidence of any separate vital force. If there were one, it could not take the place of the form, and would be wholly superfluous.

It is our purpose to pass in review a number of biological phenomena, choosing by preference those of the human body, to see what light is to be gained from a study of the physical side of the question. We shall touch on many mysterious problems in passing, and suggest questions which we cannot answer.

Let us begin with the human thigh-bone. The shaft slanting upward and outward from the knee is joined above by a short neck which runs upward and inward. This, capped by a globe-shaped head, forms a ball-and-socket joint with the pelvis at the

hip. In the adult, the angle formed by the neck and the shaft is, on the average, one of about 125° . At birth, the two parts of the bone are more nearly in line. The angle is about 160° . What is the cause of the change which subsequently occurs?

It is generally taught that the weight of the body in the erect position transmitted to the heads of the thigh-bones, tends to force the necks down, thus lessening the angle. Very strong evidence in favor of this has been brought forward by Professor Humphry.¹ He examined the bones of a child who lived some years with so enormous a head (a case of hydrocephalus) that it never could have walked. It is doubtful if it could ever have sat up. In this case the neck of the thigh-bone preserved its original infantile angle with the shaft, for the simple reason that it never was subjected to the weight which should have bent it down. The process is remarkably well stated by Humphry: "During development, pressure and growing force combine, in what may be called a harmonious antagonism to effect the desired size and form." To some extent, different parts of the developing body act on each other as external forces. When the bones of the vault of the immature skull meet along their edges each checks the growth of the other. Thus, very long heads are due to the premature union of the parietal bones in the middle line so that the growing force expends itself in a forward and backward direction. Returning to the hydrocephalic child, we find that the bones of the head are abnormally large. The reason is, that the fluid in the head kept them apart, preventing them from mutually checking each other's growth.

Thus we have two illustrations of the effect of the purely mechanical resistance of parts of the body on the development of other parts. But as we watch these and similar processes, we soon see that living matter reacts very differently from lifeless matter to certain mechanical influences. In the first place when the weight of the body has sufficiently bent the neck of the thigh-bone the process stops, except in unfortunate cases when the bones are wanting in earthy salts. The habitual bearing of weight will make the healthy bone stronger and more rugged than a life of idleness. It is a well-known fact that mechanical action from without which would wear away an inorganic substance will strengthen the growth of an organic one, provided, of course, that it be not excessive. Not only does muscle grow stronger by work, that is by overcoming resistance, but the points of its attachment to bone grow also. The raised line of its insertion, scarcely to be felt on a weak bone becomes a rough ridge on a

¹ *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology*, vol. xxiii.

strong one. This is brought about by mechanical forces, but it is not a purely mechanical process. Whatever is received, is received according to the nature of the receiver. It is by the vital principle¹ of the organism that forces which would otherwise be destructive become salutary.

Although we propose not to stray far from the development of the individual (ontogeny), we must refer to the fact that mechanical explanations are given of the changes occurring in the alleged ancestry of any species (phylogeny). Professor Macalister writes as follows in his "Text-Book of Human Anatomy:" "Mechanical environing conditions are the chief factors which determine and modify the growth of bones. Along the lines of pressure, bones become thickened and dense; along lines of tension, they become elongated and projected. With unilateral pressure, they become curved; with oblique and terminal pressure, twisted. These characters are hereditarily impressed upon bones, and we can even trace the outcome of ancestral experience in the directions in which the primary spicules are formed." Professor Cope² has attempted to explain the shape of bones by purely mechanical causes. He labors to show that both in the joints and in the length of the bones we see the results of gradual changes clinched by heredity. Whether acquired features are inherited is still a disputed point, but Professor Cope settles the matter thus: "if they are not inherited there is no evolution." This is true enough if evolution is necessarily brought about by the accumulation of minute changes. There is a system of evolution which does not require this impossibility. But let this pass. It is rather surprising to find that this author accounts for the lengthening of bones by two precisely opposite causes. He would have the long arms of apes arise by stretching from the weight of the hanging body, and again he accounts for the lengthening of certain bones in the hind limb of bounding mammals by the effect of repeated impact. If we admit this latter explanation, it is only another and an admirable example of the influence of the form, and of the difference between living and non-living matter. If pounding makes the bone grow, it can only be because the growing force is within, and its action is increased or modified by external conditions. In the same way the nature of the motion of one bone on another is said to determine the kind of joint between them. How can it do so if there be not in the parts, at the very least, a faculty of receiving adaptation, which is one of the characteristics of a living organism?

The internal structure of bone is not less interesting than the external. If we divide a long bone lengthwise we find that the

¹ We use the term "vital principle" as synonymous with "the form."

² *The Journal of Morphology*, vol. iii., 1889.

shaft is a hollow cylinder. Much greater strength is thus obtained than if the same amount of bone were moulded into a solid column. Towards the ends, the thick walls become thin. The cavity they inclose is filled with a network of bony plates and rods known as spongy-bone. If thin slices be made of this bone in the proper directions, it is found not to be a meaningless tangle but to present a well-planned architectural arrangement. This has been studied in much detail in man and animals. A much-quoted instance is that of Professor Culmann designing a crane, the stress lines of which corresponded very closely with those of the neck of the human thigh-bone. How has this distinctly purposeful structure been produced? To call it the work of chance is really too absurd. Let us suppose that a change has occurred in the surroundings of a certain animal which would make it for his advantage to have a longer neck for his thigh-bone. The longer neck, of course, requires a new disposition of the plates of bone within it representing the stress-lines. The reasonable way to account for the occurrence of such a change is that by a law of growth, in other words by the action of the form, these plates appear in their proper places, the change of outward shape and inward structure going on *pari passu*. It is not credible that the desirable change should have been brought about solely by the mating of animals somewhat more favorably built than the others, and the gradual accentuation of the advantageous peculiarities. Further it is incredible that by this process alone the longer necks of the femurs should always have the correct internal stress-lines. What a long series of generations would be required to perpetuate this piece of good fortune in the matter of only a single point in the animal economy! The race must in the meantime have dwindled almost to extinction, for the bones of those animals that did not have the luck to get correct stress-lines must have broken down from weakness, or have grown over heavy from an excess of incorrectly disposed bone.

Let us return from the origin of the peculiarities of the species to that of those of the individual. Assuming that the causes above mentioned may have modified the species, they cannot work in the embryo. Rotary motion cannot cause a ball-and-socket joint, nor angular motion a hinge joint, for the joints appear in the tiny limbs before the muscles that move them are fairly developed. As Macalister points out, the early-formed spicules of bone take the proper position. To account for this, heredity, that somewhat overworked *deus ex machinâ*, is invoked. That it has its share in the process we do not doubt, but it is that of a modifying agent. It cannot be a prime mover.

Here is another instance. Very abstruse calculations have been

made on the calibre of the arteries; on the laws regulating the place for the giving off of branches; of the sum of the calibres of the branches compared with the calibre of the parent trunk; of the thickness of the walls; of the elasticity of the coats, etc.; showing in some respects most wonderful adaptations to the laws of hydrostatics. But when we watch the development of the early capillaries, we see nothing that points to any mechanical action suggesting, or corresponding to, that of fluid in motion. Certain star-shaped cells in the tissues enlarge; their slender prolongations join with those of their neighbors; the cell contents break down, leaving a cavity and forming the blood; the cavity enlarges, extending into the prolongations which become hollow tubes, and thus an early system of bloodvessels is formed. They grow larger and form systems according to a predetermined plan, but not always the systems of the mature animal. Though in the main the difference is due to the peculiar needs of the developing body, certain changes occur from unknown causes. Certain vessels are obliterated, and others persist without any advantage that we know of. Occasionally, a vessel that should be lost survives, or *vice versâ*, and we find what we call an anomaly of the arteries, which is usually easy to understand by one who knows the ground-plan. Very probably some quasi-accidental mechanical process has deflected a part of the current from its usual course, thus causing the decline of one vessel and the rise of another. Still, two facts stand forth clearly: 1st, that the plan of the bloodvessels is not the result of hydrostatic laws; 2d, that it is for future rather than for present needs. None the less at times purely mechanical forces may intervene. When a mammal first breathes the arterial blood which till then was shot from the pulmonary artery through a tube, the *ductus arteriosus*, into the aorta, rushes instead to the lungs. The useless, or rather the now dangerous, communication with the aorta is soon closed. The mechanism is thus explained by a recent German observer:¹ The first act of respiration changes the position of the pulmonary artery. The raising of the breast bone and the fall of the diaphragm change both the direction and the calibre of the duct. Folds appear inside it. Later its cavity assumes an hour-glass shape, and soon it becomes impervious. Schanz produced similar longitudinal folds in the duct by blowing up the lungs of an immature embryo. Assuming that this explanation is correct, we have here a distinctly mechanical process; but it would be stark madness to suppose that it was simply by chance that the parts were so disposed that this desirable action should occur thus opportunely. This must be the work of a principle presiding over growth.

¹ Schanz, *Archiv für Gesampt. Physiologie*, bd. xlv., 1888.

A very curious instance of the mechanical action of certain internal structures in determining the disposition of others, and also of the tolerance of the more passive parts to the action of the first, is furnished by the recurrent laryngeal nerves which supply nearly all the muscles of the larynx. The great pneumogastric nerve emerges from the base of the skull, and runs down through the neck and chest to the stomach. Shortly after leaving the skull it gives off the superior laryngeal nerve, which runs downward to the larynx, where it is distributed chiefly to the mucous membrane, but the main trunk passes by the larynx down into the chest without giving any other branch to the larynx. The right pneumogastric nerve passes in front of the subclavian artery behind the collar bone; the left one in front of the arch of the aorta, which lies deeper in the chest. At these points the inferior laryngeal nerves are given off. They curl backward under these vessels, and then run upward along the windpipe to the larynx, thus deserving the name "recurrent." Two things in this arrangement seem very peculiar: 1st, that the nerve to the larynx should be given off so late from the parent trunk that to reach its destination it must describe a long and apparently useless retrograde circuit; 2d, that if it is to make a loop at all, the left one should not turn under the left subclavian artery symmetrically with the right, instead of under the still more remote arch of the aorta. These two peculiarities have a common cause. At an early stage of embryonic life the heart lies under the head, from which it gradually recedes. Five arterial arches on either side are developed in front of it; that is, still nearer the head. These, which are generally regarded as corresponding to the arteries of the gills in fishes and amphibians, are called the branchial arches. The pneumogastric nerve runs before this system of arches, and as it passes the last one sends beneath it the inferior nerve to the larynx. As these arches descend lower and lower into the chest, the point at which the nerve gets free from the parent trunk is dragged down with them, and thus it happens that in the adult it has to retrace its course for several inches (in the giraffe it must be for several feet) to reach its sphere of activity. The want of symmetry is due to the fact that the arch of the aorta, not the left subclavian, is developed from the arch corresponding to the one which forms the subclavian on the right. A very apt confirmation of the truth of this theory is given by cases in which the right subclavian artery arises irregularly. In these cases the last two branchial arches on the right either disappeared early or were never developed. Thus there was no structure to pull the right laryngeal nerve down into the chest, and accordingly it leaves the pneumogastric, perhaps as two or three different bundles of fibres, as the main trunk passes the larynx and

runs there directly. One could hardly imagine a more perfect demonstration of the theory that the origin of the nerve is drawn down into the chest by the artery. Yet the process is not a purely mechanical one. If in later life a man suffers from a dilatation (an aneurism) of the arch of the aorta or of the right subclavian, a common symptom is the paralysis of the muscles of the half of the larynx on the side of the disease. This is due to the injury to the nerve fibres as they curl under the artery; but the pressure to which they are subjected would seem to be far less, and the resistance of the nerve far greater, than when its hardly formed fibres were drawn so far out of place. In after life, when two structures are thus strained, one or both must suffer. In the embryo they pursue their remarkable course together, the artery does not destroy the nerve, nor does the nerve cut through the artery. The mechanical school might be tempted to reply that as this arrangement is by no means common to man but widespread throughout vertebrates, heredity has given it so firm a hold that it may be called natural; but the refutation is at hand in those cases in which the nerve does not form a loop, there being no vessel to pull it.

If we call into our service the microscope to give us a nearer view of what takes place among the elements of the developing body, we see signs of the mechanical effect of one tissue on another, and still more of a directing principle. The lung of the unhatched chick has long been a favorite object. First a single outgrowth from the gullet appears and pushes out into the surrounding tissue. Soon it divides into two tubes, one for each lung. These again divide and subdivide forming more and smaller lobules continually advancing, and destined to form the cellular lining of the bronchial tubes and air cells. But the surrounding tissue which is to form the connective tissues and bloodvessels of the lung is not idle. We see the newly-formed capillaries pressing against the epithelial cells. Two opposing forces seem to be meeting. Each triumphs at alternate points. There the epithelial cells rush forward against the vessels, and on either side the vessels rush in against the cells. Thus a wavy line is produced which grows more and more complicated as the air-cells are formed. Franz Boll¹ rejected the view that any one tissue should be considered the moulding one. He declared the process to be a conflict, and the result a compromise. From his description we see that all the elements of the tissues are alive; but what he does not tell us is that it is no blind struggle but an harmonious action presided over by a guiding and vivifying principle, the form. Were it otherwise, how slight an irregularity in the early processes would

¹ *Das Princip. des Wachstums.* Berlin, 1876.

distort the growth of the organ! How frequent, or rather how general, must be the occurrence of such irregularities were there no restraining influence! The plan of the lung would be hopelessly confused. That species should have any typical plan of lung would be obviously impossible. Evidences of this super-mechanical principle are rife, not only in normal development but under entirely different circumstances.

The artificial production in animals of monstrosities and deformities is something higher than scientific play. Dr. Wilhelm Roux undertook a series of experiments to ascertain to what extent the fertilized ovum, or even parts of it, could develop of itself; to what extent it depended on external influences. He found when a fertilized frog's egg showed on the surface a division into two halves, if one of these was injured in the proper way with a hot needle, that it remained undeveloped, and that the other half of the egg became, as the case might be, the right or left half of a tadpole. "This," writes Roux, "is certainly surprising; but what is wonderful is that at a later period the half which is entirely wanting is perfectly developed from the other. This can occur in the same way as in the regeneration of lost parts. The cells on the surface of the side of the body towards the defect increase and form such shapes that all that is wanting of the typical animal is replaced."¹ This is indeed analogous to the restoration of lost parts in animals low in the scale, and to the less perfect repair of injured parts in higher ones. It is only more striking. The more we study the process the more clearly we see that it can be accounted for by no purely mechanical system. It is fatal to the theory that each part of the body must be developed from a certain part of the blastoderm. It is fatal to any purely mechanical theory. It shows the agency of something higher.

What is this principle of growth? According to the scholastic philosophy it is the form. According to many scientists of the day it does not exist. Their efforts to get on without it are pitiable. Others admit frankly their ignorance. Thus Roux: "We do not yet know what forces are present in the fertilized ovum, nor how they are grouped, so that they are able to start the development of the individual. We do not know what combination of forces carry on this development. In short, we do not know *why* a typically formed highly complicated organism comes from a simple egg, nor why the organism thus formed is able, in spite of constant change of matter, to maintain itself for a long time comparatively unchanged."² As we have already implied, many have

¹ *Die Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen*. Eine Festrede, 1889. Also Virchow's *Archiv.*, Bd. cxiv., 1888.

² Festrede, p. 5.

raised heredity into a kind of idol, attributing to it powers beyond its sphere. There is something almost pathetic in the way that a positivist anatomist appeals to it to explain the origin of the arrangement of the convolutions of the brain and at the same time admits the weakness of the explanation. "To sum up, as the morphogenic explanation of the folding of the surface of the brain, we are reduced to the commonplace formula that the hemispheres, passing through the various stages of their development, obey this *quid ignotum* called heredity which stamps each of our organs with its specific seal. The reader will admit with us that this is no explanation, and the formula in question can hardly satisfy a positive mind seeking not words but clear and precise answers."¹

Very probably he would retort on us that the scholastic doctrine of the form is not a whit more satisfactory. Generations have laughed at the last act of the *Malade Imaginaire* when the hero replies in his examination to the question why opium causes sleep: "*quia est in eo virtus dormitiva.*" The sarcasm of the enthusiastic applause of the chorus: "*bene, bene, bene, bene, respondere*" was perhaps as much directed at the philosophy as at the medicine of the day. Professor His² parodies it in this connection. Such replies as ours to the question why protoplasm can develop into certain organisms amount to saying: "*quia est in eo virtus formativa.*" The comparison seems to us perfectly just. In neither answer is there the slightest explanation of the mode of action of the *virtus*, be it *dormitiva* or *formativa*. The difficulty is in the limitation of our powers. With many persons it is made greater by the error of confounding the imagination with the understanding. We recognize the truth of many things which we cannot represent to our imagination. For instance, it is certain that we see. It is easy to prove that matter pure and simple cannot see. Therefore there is something besides matter that is essential to sight. The fact that we do not in the least know *how* we see does not weaken the force of the argument. In the same way it can be proved that the doctrine of a form (or soul) by which animals and plants grow into their proper shape is reasonable, though we remain in ignorance of its *modus operandi*. The question is not in the least a new one in metaphysics, but the growth of the study of biology has brought it before a new audience and calls for its discussion from the physical standpoint. In the days of St. Thomas there were no means of studying the physical phenomena. Perhaps they were passed by too easily; but it is hard to judge justly in such cases. They were not ignored, for the scholastic system recognized fully the share of matter in the process; but they were treated

¹ L. Testut, *Traité d'Anatomie Humaine*. Tome ii., p. 476, 1891.

² *Unsere Körperform*, 1874.

from the metaphysical standpoint. At that time it could hardly have been otherwise. It is likely enough that advancing science will show us one mechanical process after another, and drive further and further back the super-material action, but it is safe to say that it can never be dislodged. It will be seen to act as a director of processes, even if all the processes themselves should prove capable of strictly mechanical statement. Professor His's theory of "imparted motion" may have a great future before it, but it will never free itself from the need of a directing principle. Indeed, this leader of embryologists in a recent paper of great value¹ declares his belief that all efforts to find in matter alone the solution of the problems of generation and growth must fail. He concludes as follows: "The interaction, according to law, of numberless individual processes makes every degree of development the result of preceding and the conditions for future degrees; but on our mind it makes the impression of that internal order for which even to-day the old definition of Leibnitz, pre-established harmony, is the most fitting." One is tempted to wonder whether aught but prejudice could lead such a man to see in this theory any superiority to that of matter and form.

II.

Let us turn to some of the difficulties, real or apparent, connected with this teaching. In the first place if there be a form, it is clear that it must act teleologically; that is for an end. As has been shown, the parts grow for a future usefulness. We do not see because at first useless organs in lower animals have luckily become eyes; but eyes develop in order that we may see. This, we know, is not the fashionable theory, but the impossibility of any fortuitous system has been so often shown that it is not worth while to repeat the refutations resting on the doctrine of chances. Still we are inclined to believe that teleologists have sometimes gone too far, and not they only, but others who see in shape only an adaptation to surrounding influences. Thus in old times we heard much of the perfection of organs and organisms which more accurate observation does not appear to have borne out. Wolff² writing of the internal structure of bone declared that not only could the function be deduced from the shape, and the shape from the function, but that bones were made on the only possible plan. This is pure assumption. The vertebræ of an alligator are both without and within very different from those of a mammal. One, in short, is on the reptilian, the other on the mammalian plan. It

¹ *Zur Geschichte des Gehirns*, etc., Band xiv., Abhandlungen der mathemat.—physichen Classe des Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

² *Virchow's Archiv.*, Bd. I., 1870.

is not proved, nor in our opinion is it likely, that the static and dynamic needs of the spine of the alligator could not be met by vertebræ founded on the mammalian type.

There is a projection called the third trochanter near the upper end of the thigh-bone, which is found well marked in hoofed animals with an odd number of toes, but which is wanting, or at most rudimentary in those with even toes. Thus it is met with in the horse and the rhinoceros, but not in the deer and the ox. Yet it is very hard to believe that the needs of the horse and rhinoceros are so similar, and so different from those of the deer and the ox, that it should be a necessity to the former, and useless to the latter. There are those who on such grounds unjustifiably attack the general principle of teleology. We on the contrary hold to it firmly. We merely say that it seems to us rash to apply it too strictly to details of structure, ignoring that there may be circumstances, heredity for instance, which modify the action of the form.

This brings us to certain phenomena which are claimed by the most extreme and least critical Darwinians as fatal to any non-evolutionary hypothesis. We refer to rudimentary organs, and to anomalies in which some feature that is normal in certain animals appears occasionally in man. Some of the rudimentary organs seem to admit of easy explanation; but some of the anomalies are most perplexing. This third trochanter is a case in point. It is found not rarely in the human thigh-bone. It is not due to the strain of muscles nor to particular occupations. It is found in delicate bones. It is found occasionally in savage races, among the individuals of which there was presumably no great difference in mode of life. Moreover it may be found in young persons, which proves that it is not the result of any long-continued habit or position. We have attempted to show in a preceding number of this REVIEW¹ and elsewhere, that many of the anomalies cannot be explained as reversions. Some of these animal peculiarities cannot be made to fit into any conceivable scheme of human descent. Still there must be a cause. What is it?

Modern Catholic writers seem to us to leave much to be desired in their treatment of this subject. Father Pesch² speaks of anomalies as mostly of a pathological character.

We do not think that this view is justified; but even if it were they none the less call for explanation. Father Harper³ in a note

¹ Vol. xi., July, 1886.

² *Die grossen Welträthsel*. T. Pesch, S. J. Bd. ii., s. 237. It is to be regretted that this truly admirable work has not been translated into English, and is not more generally known. It is the subject of a very interesting paper, "The Battle of Theism," by the Rev. William Barry in the *Dublin Review*, of October, 1884.

³ *The Metaphysics of the School*, vol. ii., p. 645.

accounts for rudimentary organs as follows: "But these physical facts offer no real difficulty, if we accept the doctrine of Aristotle and of the Angelic Doctor. They are the result on the matter of antecedent provisional Forms which have carried on the organization to its appointed term; and their arrest is due to the action of that higher Form which finally determined the specific nature." We shall not presume to discuss the vexed question of successive forms in the human embryo, nor shall we consider how far ontogeny is a true abstract of phylogeny; suffice it to say that if we admit both, the mystery of the occasional appearance in man of a peculiarity of a member of some distant side branch of the alleged genealogical tree still remains untouched. Professor Mivart in his excellent "Truth" says little or nothing of anomalies occurring in individual members of a species.

From anomalies to monstrosities there is but a step. We do not mean that they are of the same nature, but that it is often hard in practice to draw a sharp line between them. The subject is a vast one, which we shall not attempt to deal with. We shall refer merely to a few remarkable facts not easy to account for. If the tail of a lizard be properly cut or broken off, sometimes two, sometimes even three new ones will come in its place. If the forelimb of a triton be amputated the new one is said to have occasionally an additional finger. It would seem as if under certain abnormal conditions the form may act with excessive but ill-regulated energy. Such examples are most common among lower animals, but very extraordinary cases of reduplication of parts are sometimes found in man. Sometimes the hands and feet show not only extra fingers and toes but are clearly made by the fusion of two hands or feet on a single arm or leg. There is a very rare specimen in the museum of the Harvard Medical School illustrating this condition. It is a dissected left arm bearing seven fingers arranged as follows: First there are the four fingers of a normal left hand, but the thumb is wanting and at that side, there is a portion of a right hand bearing the little, ring and middle fingers. The hands are so placed in their fusion that the palms are on the same side, and that the line of union is between the forefinger of the left hand and the middle finger of the right. The forearm has two bones as is natural, but a glance shows that they are two ulnæ; that is, there is a doubling of the bone of the same side as the little fingers, while the radius, the bone of the thumb side, is wanting. In short, from the elbow down this man had a limb composed of the inner parts of two fused together. The origin of such deformities is extremely obscure. This is not the place to discuss the matter in detail. Suffice it to say that we incline to the hypothesis of an action analogous to that by which a multi-

plicity of lizards' tails is brought about. Should that be the case the question arises whether the matter or the form is at fault. According to the scholastic system the form does not err. Defects depend on the matter inasmuch as the form requires a proper disposition of the matter for its full and free action. In accord with this we may notice in the cases of the lizards and the tritons (perhaps also in this human arm) that the action of the form does not become erratic, so to speak, till the matter has suffered injury. Still why or how this should induce a reduplication is most obscure. If these questions are hard to answer according to the scholastic system we know of no other that makes them easier. It is quite as impossible that matter alone, without a directing form, should develop into the inner halves of two forearms fused together as into the normal limb. Other and, perhaps, still more puzzling cases might be mentioned. Nothing is further from our thought than to imply that the system of matter and form makes clear even the simplest of the problems we have before us. The point we wish to emphasize is that, though not clear to our imagination, this system is satisfactory to reason. There is no conflict between it and the observations of physical science. It shows that life is the result of an immanent force. External forces (counting as such the physical properties even of internal parts of the organism) can and do modify, but cannot originate. That the mode of action of the form is beyond us is not a defect of the system but the consequence of our limited powers. After all what process of physical forces even in non-living bodies can we claim to truly know and understand?

THOMAS DWIGHT.

PIUS IX. AMID FRIENDS AND FOES—1848.

“IF like St. Peter I had the power to strike down men of the same character as Ananias and Saphira, and if I willed to use that power, the Vatican would be the tomb of the diplomacy which has always deceived me.”¹ At Portici Pius IX. spoke these suggestive words, in February, 1850, just two years after the decisive *Non Voglio*. Suggestive words they are indeed to those who are seeking to know the truth about the dealings of European governments with the Papacy during the last half century. How many deceptions the truth-loving Pope must have suffered between 1848 and 1850! As for the Ananiases outside of the diplomatic body, where would he have found a mausoleum capacious enough to contain them!

Within a fortnight after the remarkable scene in the Quirinal piazza, the puppet of a revolution, Louis Philippe, was flung aside. The Carbonari, Masons, Socialists, who lifted him on a throne he was not worthy of, had long been preparing his downfall. Beginning with 1840, not a year passed in which public order was not disturbed by one émeute at least. Nowadays revolutionaries affect the “Congress.” During the forties the banquet was in fashion. No less than seventy banquets were offered the French “people” in the course of the year 1847. The French and Italian methods were similar. They were devised by the same calculating heads. At length a monster banquet at Paris was announced—a banquet for the entertainment of one hundred thousand guests. The joke was serious, more serious than Guizot knew. When the government said nay, the genial banqueters brought out their guns and bludgeons. The ever convenient barricade was scientifically builded. Banqueters that might have been, found playful amusement in the cutting of fraternal throats and the robbery of equals who surely doubted their own freedom. (February 24, 1848.) Louis Philippe retired and the convenient “republic” bowed itself into his place. And such a republic! with the sentimentally sweet phrase-maker, Lamartine, to represent it before Europe, and back of him Ledru-Rollin, Felix Pyat, Proudhon, Crémieux, Louis Blanc, the Bonapartes, and others of that ilk. The possibility of a Socialistic republic troubles cool minds to-day. In 1848 the French had a short experience of such a republic. The Socialists were the first to tire of the experiment. Blanqui, Barbès, Cabet

¹ *La Souveraineté Pontificale*, Dupanloup, p. 238, Paris, 1861, 3d ed.

demanding something more advanced—the “democratic” republic, a republic in which all men should work, except the members of the Socialist party. Once more the barricades and the madmen behind them—three days of slaughter. (June, 1848.) Seven generals, an Archbishop, five thousand guilty and guiltless are sacrificed to Socialist “democracy.” Thanks to Cavaignac who, by his firmness and courage during the three days, made up for earlier and later indiscretions, France was saved from another “Terror.”

The Paris revolution of February was only the first of a series long planned. At Vienna, on March 11th, a demonstration was made against Metternich. The windows of his dwelling were smashed. On the 12th and 13th the students and the other mob threatened more forcibly. To pacify them, Metternich resigned. On the 17th, that proper enemy of the Jesuits, Lola Montez, danced out of Munich, and her royal patron removed the crown that was worth more than his head. The Berliners tried to hide themselves behind barricades on the 18th, and regretfully Frederick William shot down two hundred of them. The Milanese surprised their Austrian governors on the same day. Before the end of the month the whole of Lombardo-Venetia, Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont, had imitated Paris,

The rising at Milan was not unpremeditated. Under Austrian rule Lombardy and Venice were well governed—governed in the interest of the people and not of a class. With the government the people were satisfied; but the aristocracy and the secret societies had long before united their forces and determined to be rid of the German. From Turin the revolutionary aristocracy of Lombardy was managed. Without the assistance of Piedmont the Austrian could not be dislodged. Charles Albert, “half devotee, half Carbonaro,” would, but dare not. The Mazzinians had made “United Italy” a watchword in the land; but Mazzini would have no king at the head of Mazzinian Italy. The revolutionary aristocrats meant to have a king, and that king was to be the Piedmontese king. To use the aristocracy to abolish kings was Mazzini’s game. To extend the power of a petty monarchy, with the aid and at the expense of the dagger revolutionaries, was the aim of Charles Albert. Piedmont had no cause of quarrel with Austria. Defeat in an unjust war the king feared. Still he greedily ambitioned the crown of Italy. The Giobertians pushed him on, nor could he hide from his sight “the dagger of the conspirator” with which Mazzini threatened him.¹ Anxiously the king provided against a military failure; and all things being ready, he insisted that the Lombards should revolt

¹ See Mazzini’s letter of April 27, 1847.—*Life and Letters*, vol. i., p. 58.

before his army moved. A revolution at Milan was accordingly planned, the date agreed upon being the 21st of March. Mean-time news came of the Viennese riots, and the Milanese leaders thought it better to hasten events. Long Live Italy! Long Live Pius IX! Long Live the Sovereign Pontiff! With these calculated cries Milan was aroused on the 18th of the month. Radetzky, taken unawares, retired ingloriously. On the 20th a provisional government nominated itself and issued a manifesto under "the invocation of Pius IX." How deeply the aristocrats venerated the Pope!

Charles Albert was not ready. His minister, the Giobertian Balbo, assured the Austrian ambassador of the King's friendly and peaceful intentions, and at the same time the King was rehearsing his favorite rôle: the Sword of Italy. At length, after proclaiming his desire for the independence of "our beautiful Italy," and his purpose of placing himself and his son at the head of an army for the liberation of Lombardy, Charles Albert crossed the Ticino. Noble prince! He went to give "a brother's aid to brothers. *Let there be no word of recompense; when the war is ended the fate of the beautiful country will be decided.*"¹ Just now let us sing a Te Deum, and shout: Long life to Pius IX! Pareto, the colleague of Balbo, was at the same time writing to Abercrombie, British Minister at Turin,—like all Palmerston's agents, a backer of Piedmont,—a diplomatic letter, couched in these terms: "After the events in France, the danger of an early proclamation of a republic in Lombardy cannot be concealed. The king thinks himself obligated *to take measures*, which will hinder the actual movement from becoming a republican movement, and which will relieve the rest of Italy from the catastrophes that might occur, should such a form of government be proclaimed."² How many Ananiases were there in Turin? Time will tell. And here a suggestion, happily made by Léopold de Gaillard! The King of Sardinia is about to "take measures." From this time on you will see that the politics and the policy of the Piedmontese monarchy have a single end—to *take* something, and to take without right, and with the generous motive of protecting *the rest* of Italy against possible catastrophes. Altruism personified!

As soon as Charles Albert entered Lombardy, a swarm of raw recruits, idealists, brigands, patriots, Carbonari, Young Italians, and also of regular soldiers, followed him. From Naples they came, and from Tuscany. His whole army numbered a

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 196.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 195; Van Duerem, *Les Vicissitudes Politiques*, p. 181; *L'Expédition de Rome*, Léopold de Gaillard, p. 48.

hundred thousand fairly equipped though imperfectly organized men. Bands played the Hymn of Pius IX. The Pope's name glittered on flag and banner. A crusade, the anti-Austrian war was called. Many of the soldiers wore a cross on the breast of their uniforms. Under the protection of Heaven and with the blessing of the Pontiff, thus Charles Albert proclaimed, he set out to *take* Austria's provinces. Outside of his own territory, the Pope's name was still a convenience to the Ananiases. And at Rome, were the revolutionists, perhaps, once more using the Pope's good name to further their evil designs? Let us recall the facts that make up the history of Roman politics since the night of February 11th.

The Constitution fever was raging. The Italians caught the disease. One after another the princes supplied the quieting prescription—first, Charles Albert (Feb. 8th), and then Pius (March 14th). "Provided that religion be safe, we shall refuse no necessary innovation," said the Pope. "In our country a constitution is not a new thing. The States that have one to-day, copied it out of our history. Since the time of our illustrious predecessor, Sixtus V., we have had, in the Sacred College, a chamber of Peers."¹ The idea of a constitution may indeed have been suggested by the history of the Church; but the constitutions in vogue were not at all churchlike. Doctor Brownson's words fit them precisely: "constitutions drawn up with 'malice aforethought,' having no support in the habits and traditions of the people who are to live under them."² The Pope questioned the wisdom of a constitution, and would have preferred to see how his neighbors accommodated themselves to their new "statutes," but in the interest of peace he was ready to go to the farthest limit that conscience would permit. Each concession that he made was, however, only a new weapon placed in the hands of the desperate men who had sworn to destroy the Papacy.

To a war with Austria the revolutionaries had long looked forward. Again and again had they tried to embroil the Pope with the emperor. A division between these rulers would have pleased the Roman "patriots" better than this Piedmontese campaign. The Mazzinians guessed at the recompense which a victorious Charles Albert would demand. Assuredly he would not forthwith resign in favor of the socialistic republic. Still any war was better than none. It could be used to ruin the Pope. Either he must fight Austria, and thus, probably, cause a schism, besides making a powerful enemy and weakening his means of defence against domestic foes. Or he must refuse to fight, and thus draw upon

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 175; Balleydier, *Hist. de la Révolution de Rome*, p. 61.

² *Liberalism and the Church*, p. 77.

himself the hatred of all the infuriated "patriots" in Italy and unite them more defiantly against his powers, spiritual and temporal.

The pressure brought to bear on him did not move Pius IX. He refused to declare war. "Our name," he said, "has been blest throughout the world for the first words of peace that went forth from our lips; assuredly it could not be so, if words of war came from them."¹ He did, however, act as a sovereign, careful of his rights. An army of 17,000 men was despatched to the frontier to protect his territory from invasion (March 23d). Across the Po the commander was forbidden to move. He was a Piedmontese, Durando by name, and his chief adjutant was another Piedmontese, Massimo d'Azeglio. Painter, poet, novelist, d'Azeglio was now a politician, a "liberal," loving the Church devotedly, the Pope and the Papacy extravagantly, and himself somewhat more. In Piedmont his family had not despised office. By tradition, d'Azeglio was a staunch monarchist, devoted to the crown and filled with its ambitions. Like Gioberti, he thought he was the only man who could manage the affairs of the Church in the nineteenth century. He wrote and spoke much in a warning way, exposing all the "deficiencies" of the Papal government, appealing to the Pope to do what d'Azeglio told him, and thus lead the world. He was an *Italianissimo*, bitterly anti-Austrian, and looked upon war against Austria as a Christian act that any Pope might be proud of. As a negotiator with the secret societies he had helped to "harmonize" various political interests. Indeed, d'Azeglio was a typical "harmonizer," always ready to give away valuable things, not in his charge, for a handful of nothing. At Rome he had been recently attending banquets, and making fine patriotic speeches to the multitude. He was somewhat wiser before he died. Durando he had presented to the people from a balcony, as "the sword and buckler of Italian independence." Charles Albert was satisfied with being called "the sword." The Reverend Father Gavazzi, the Barnabite, with other patriotic priests—Ugo Bassi for instance—followed Durando and Azeglio to the frontier.

The generals of the Papal army had accepted a trust, with the intention of violating it. Arrived at the frontier, the Piedmontese, Durando, issued an address to his army, speciously conceived. "Radetzki is making war on the Cross of Christ," said the truly Christian general. "Hence, soldiers! it is becoming, and I have ordered, that all of us should carry the Cross of Christ upon our breasts. All those who belong to the army of operation will bear it on the heart, as I myself do."² The Ananiases of diplomacy

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 211.

² Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 109.

could not have done much better. In order that the soldiers should not mistake the fact that Durando, d' Azeglio, Bassi and Gavazzi were really engaged in a crusade, the old cry: "Dieu le veut!" was made the war-cry, and against the Pope's express command his army crossed the Po, and joined the Venetian insurgents. The Mazzinians were audacious. Treachery to the Papacy they counted a virtue. And yet these "patriot" traitors were not pure Mazzinians, but, on the contrary, true "liberal" sons of the Church—the *free* Church.

Five days after the Piedmontese Papal general's proclamation, Pius IX. protested. "The Pope," said he, "does not speak by the voice of a subaltern." But Durando's action was well received by the clubs, and they agitated the Holy City as only they could. Meetings, petitions, committees, there was no end of. The holy war,—the "people" demanded the holy war; and the Pope ought to open the Roman campaign by excommunicating the Austrians. Cicerruacchio, the perjured Carbonari, the patriot priests, the coward nobility were especially desirous that the spiritual weapons of the Papacy should be turned against the Austrians.

What could Pius do with these traitors and energumens? Nothing beyond making his record right before the world. He spoke often, but he prayed more often. On April 29th he delivered the famous allocution by which he relieved the Papacy of any responsibility for the anti-Austrian war. "We hold on earth the place of Him who is the author of peace, the friend of charity, and faithful to the obligations of our supreme apostolate, we embrace all countries, all peoples, all nations, with an equal sentiment of paternal love." The crusade that Pius ever preached was a crusade of peace, concord, charity. His intense desire for peace can be measured from the letter sent on May 3, to Ferdinand of Austria. "With an affection wholly paternal," writes the Pope, "I exhort you to withdraw your arms from a war which cannot possibly reconquer the hearts of the Lombards and Venetians, but which must bring in its train war's hateful calamities. The generous German nation will not find it amiss that I should invite an exchange of domination, depending only on the sword, for amicable, neighborly relations. We are confident that a nation so legitimately proud of its own nationality, will not put its honor to a bloody trial as against the Italian nation, but will rather recognize the latter as a sister."¹

Austria gave ear to the Pontiff's prudent words of warning. Pius wrote to the Piedmontese king, counselling peace and offering mediation; and had Piedmont wished peace, peace it could

¹ Van Duerm., *loc cit.*, pp. 185-186.

have had, "without the danger of an early proclamation of the republic in Lombardy." It is true that the Mazzinians were opposed to peace, and by means of local risings in the Tyrol and in Dalmatia tried to irritate Austria beyond the possibility of peace. And yet Austria made extraordinary efforts to reach an arrangement with Charles Albert. As early as May 24th, negotiations were opened through Lord Palmerston, Austria offering to give up Lombardy, provided a settlement of the debt could be agreed upon; nor did the emperor cease the negotiations until the beginning of July, when it became evident that England as well as Piedmont desired no peace on any terms other than forced terms.¹ The defeat and disgrace of Austria, Palmerston hoped for. A victory that should protect "the rest of Italy from catastrophes that might occur," was Charles Albert's dream. The great sacrifices to which Austria was willing to submit, were looked upon as proofs of weakness. The king, with his usual bravado, talked cleverly in public about the impossibility, in a war undertaken for *Italian unity*, of accepting any conditions other than that of complete deliverance.² The Emperor took the king at his word, and the octogenarian Radetzky delivered Lombardy and Venice completely from the various Italian armies that had crusaded there during a short five months. At Custozza (July 25th), Charles Albert's sword was whipped out of his hand. "It was not a retreat, it was a flight."³ On the 6th of August, Radetzky entered Milan. Charles Albert dared not halt even there. Radetzky was received as a liberator by the people who had gained the credit of driving him out. Charles Albert the Lombards now despised. He was a traitor, they said. The Austrians, once he had crossed the river, left him to himself and the Piedmontese. His kingdom they respected. "*Italia farà da sè*," the Piedmontese king boastingly said when he began to "take measures to hinder the actual movement from becoming a republican movement." *Farà da sè*? The ex adjutant of the Papal army, Massimo d'Azeglio, after he had seen some of the sad results of his hot-headed, destructive "liberal" agitation, informed the public he had misled, that: "Italy was not prepared in mind, heart, morals, or military habits."⁴ And what had the Durandese Papal army done for united Italy? With the Cross of Christ on their hearts, what should the "Roman" soldiers not have done? In May, the Austrians drubbed them soundly, but then let the prisoners free on their promise to return to their own territory and to fight no more. Durando broke his promise. Early

¹ Van Duerm., *loc cit.*, p. 187; Cantu., *loc cit.*, p. 221.

² Cantu., *loc cit.*, p. 221.

³ *Une Année de ma Vie* (1848-1849); Le Comte de Hübner, Paris, 1891, p. 270.

⁴ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii, p. 198, note.

in June they were once more beaten by Radetzky's forces, and again paroled. When the survivors did settle down on the Papal States, it is not difficult to imagine that, to the peace of the people and of the authorities, they contributed as freely as they had to rapine and bloodshed, causes of want and tears in so many disunited Italian homes. Gavazzi, like a true chaplain, betook himself to Genoa where he tried to help the unification of Italy by organizing revolution and a republic.

It was to La Farina, the Sicilian revolutionary who found a faithful friend in Ausonio Franchi, that Pius IX said: "I am more Italian than you are, but in me you will not distinguish the Italian from the Pontiff." The allocution of April 29th had shown that Pius willed to be both Pontiff and Italian. His letter to the Emperor made plain the same fact. The Pope's desire for unity was known to the Italian princes and people. In 1847 he had invited all the Italian States to take a first step in the way of political unity by forming a Customs' Union; but he found no support. The cry for a nation had, in fact, only one of two meanings: a republic with Mazzini in Rome, or a monarchy with a Piedmontese king in Rome. The Pope! He was the victim marked for destruction by royalist and socialist. "Unity" was a convenient cover for "robbery." When offering himself to Charles Albert as a mediator, Pius wrote that he acted as "the prince of peace, but always with a view to establishing the Italian nationality."¹ Put yourself in the Austrian camp and you will not wonder at hearing German protests against the Pope's Italianism. He was indeed the only Italian prince that honestly wished and worked for the unity of the Italian nation. And because he was honest,—but mark the course of the conspirators!

On the very day after the allocution, the clubs were hotly demonstrating. The Pope was a traitor, the enemy of the Italian cause,—death to all priests! A Committee on War and a Committee on Public Security were appointed by Sterbini, Ciceruacchio, Canino. The Committee on Public Safety saw that the cardinals were hunted and jailed, that priests were beaten in the streets, and that a shameful disorder made of the Holy City a brute's cage. It was a cage. The city gates, the Castle of Sant Angelo, were picketed. Violating the mails, all the letters addressed to cardinals and prelates were opened. Ciceruacchio was appointed public lector. He read the letters to the "people." A certain Angelo Fiorentino proposed that they have a general massacre of the priests. Ciceruacchio, another Angel, affirmed his readiness to manage the affair. Perhaps it is the Italian opera that

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 213.

leads many to associate the balcony with the idea of love-making. In 1848 the balcony was a part of the Italian demagogue's luggage. Mamiani had his balcony. "No priest in the public functions!" the philosopher cried from the balcony. There were at this time in the public functions about a hundred clerics to six thousand laymen. "Down with the ministry," all the professional bawlers shouted. A new ministry there must be, or ———! "You, my friends, can burn a mattress with a match, but it looks as if three days were needed to overturn a government,"¹ said Ciceruacchio, archly. The Pope was absolutely in the hands of a savage mob. They had their ministry. Mamiani, the determined enemy of the Papacy, was put at the head of the Papal government, and, of all men, Galletti took charge of the police. The public order—revolutionary order—was assured. In good time the conspirator, Mamiani, retired and was replaced by the more moderate Fabbri, whose years and moderation bore heavily on him. At length the Pope, on Fabbri's resigning, obtained a minister in whom he had some confidence, Pellegrino Rossi.

Mamiani would have no priests in the public service. Like so many philosophers, the Count was a poor logician. However, as a minister he acted logically. He proceeded to put the Pope out of the government. Opening the "constitutional" Chambers, composed almost wholly of Carbonari, Cardinal Altieri read the Pope's address, of which Mamiani had previous knowledge. The Minister had an address prepared. He frankly stated his notions about Italian unity and nationality. His Holiness, Mamiani thus dismissed: "The Pope, established and firm in the integrity of the dogmas of religion, *prays, blesses and pardons*; the Holy Father abandons to the Chambers the direction of the most important affairs of the State."² Brutus Napoleon in the Papal Ministry! And the temporal power abolished without so much as a blow! Pius protested against Mamiani's attack on the Papal rights and rejected the Minister's programme, except inasmuch as it agreed with the Constitution. The Pope not only prays, blesses, pardons, Pius said; he also *binds and looses*. Mamiani gave no heed to the Pope's words. The Minister's journal, the *Epoca*, spread his revolutionary ideas, and the Minister acted in a revolutionary manner. The Pope had refused to declare war against Austria. Mamiani incited the people to take part in the war and decreed the formation of a new reserve corps. Durando he pushed on. From the Pope, the minister demanded a solemn anathema against the

¹ Cf. Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 212; *La Rivoluzione Romana*, Giuseppe Boero, Firenze, 1850, pp. 108-111; Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 120-126.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 213; *Les Sociétés Secrètes*, par Claudio Jannet, Paris, 1882, vol. ii., p. 297; *La Rivoluzione Romana*, p. 115; Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 145.

Austrian troops—an anathema to be pronounced in St. Peter's amid draperies of black and from an altar lighted only by the gloom. No means did Mamiani omit that could excite the rabble, complicate the Pope at home and abroad, and permanently undermine the Temporal Power. When the minister resigned it was only because he counted upon adding to the Pope's difficulties. Having organized disorder, Mamiani argued that he had made it impossible for Pius to bring back order. The most imposing incident connected with Mamiani's ministry is the victory won by the Durando army. A roving troop of the Crusaders, having tramped back to Rome, made a dashing assault on a fortress within whose walls many a good soldier had fought the good fight. In a jiffy the Crusaders captured the proud citadel—the Gesù.

"A species of delirium took possession of men's minds in 1847." Mazzini's testimony is worthy of remembrance. Nations as well as individuals may have a delirium, a temporary madness, mania, aberration. Mazzini knew mankind well enough to know that human wits can create and spread an epidemic of delirium. "Do not allow the people to fall idly into sleep, outside the circle of the movement. Surround them always with noise, emotions, surprises, lies and feasts. Let there be disorder everywhere." These are notable words written by the founder of Young Italy, the apostle of the dagger; and he added with a devilish cunning: "Revolutionize a country one cannot with peace, morality and truth. In order to come to us, the people must be beside themselves." ⁴ Delirium, in the physician's sense, is not a disease. It is a symptom of disease. Cut out truth and morality from the soul; insert lies, disorder; excite body and soul by means of noise, emotions, surprises, feasts, and you will have a complicated disease, a double delirium, a delirium physical and moral. This is the delirium we are studying—the delirium of Revolution; a frightful disorder—whose seeds are sown, developed, nurtured by men—lying, immoral, and methodically mad.

Told in detail, the story of the manifestations of the Italian delirium, during 1848, would be long in the telling. While Charles Albert was freeing beautiful Lombardy from the German, the whole of Italy was noisy, excited; noisy with the rhetoric of the demagogue, praising, attacking; noisy with the abuse bandied by rival politicians and with the rhetoric of the dilettanti and the dreamers. Everywhere the tricolor waved. The King's army carried it, against his will. In the journals any one, every one, was lampooned; the most radical doctrines were taught. Of honor,

⁴ Claudio Jannet, *loc. cit.*, p. 298.

faith, decency, self-respect, the journalist had no more than the orator. To the Revolutionaries the news of a victory or of a defeat served equally. Indeed, they manufactured defeats and victories in order to intensify "popular" frenzy. The Kingdom of Naples was turned upside down. Tuscany was a great mad-house. Here the people could boast of two governments to-day; to-morrow of none. There the ministry that had been forced into office was promptly hooted and hissed into disgrace. Italy free, Italy independent, The King of Italy, The Italian Republic,—such were the uniting, dividing shibboleths. Archbishops were busy blessing flags and singing *Te Deums*; priests, monks, friars applauded the wildest, most blatant spouters. In the army of liberation there was more than one company of promising seminarians. After Custozza, imagine the emotions, surprises, lies, disorder! And the losses, the debts, the taxes,—perhaps the undelirious alone suffered and paid.

The "Moral Dictator of Italy," was he idle, was he neglectful of the Fatherland, while his pupils were doing such glorious work? Idle! Listen, and then answer. To free Italy without Gioberti's aid seemed ridiculous. He was elected a member of the Piedmontese Senate. Thus an end came to his fifteen years of exile. To Turin he hurried and was received with exultation. Here an example or two of the contradictions of the "law of gradation" may not be out of place. In 1847 Gioberti wrote in this vein: "What does Austria fear? Perhaps that Charles Albert or some other Italian prince may take up arms and invade Lombardy. Nonsense! Austria knows as well as others know that such an undertaking is to-day impossible, and that ideas of this kind cannot enter into, nor find a place in the mind of a prince as wise as the king of Sardinia."¹ And one of his mouthpieces later proclaimed: "He who cries 'Death to Austria, Long live the King of Italy,' is the enemy of Pius IX., and hence, a schismatic; he is the enemy of Charles Albert, and hence a rebel; he is the enemy of Christian civilization, and hence a barbarous traitor." Meantime in Piedmont they were debating about the proper form of government for the future Italian nation. Should there be a republic or a constitutional monarchy? Gioberti was clearing the way for his election. On February 26, 1848, he wrote a "gradational" letter. "I do not see a great difference between the two forms of government. A constitutional prince is nothing more than a hereditary head of a republic, and a president of a republic is only an elective prince."² A senator at Turin, the "Moral Dictator" forthwith devoted himself to a propaganda in

¹ Caniu, *loc. cit.*, p. 193, note.

² Caniu, *loc. cit.*, p. 205, note.

favor of the anti-Austrian war. Besides he acted as the agent of the Piedmontese Ministry in carrying out their scheme of absorbing Lombardo-Venetia by a specious process called fusion; a scheme that was just about completed when Charles Albert scurried away from Custozza. Gioberti's labors were confined neither to Piedmont nor to Lombardy. The Pope's allocution had divided him from Italy. The evil must be corrected. Gioberti will go to Rome to convert Pius IX. But if the Pope decline to be converted, then the Moral Dictator will proclaim Charles Albert king of Rome.¹ Is this the work of a compound "schismatic, rebel and barbarous traitor?" No friend of Gioberti thus qualified him. The Dictator's journey to Rome was that of a conqueror. In many of the cities that were honored with his presence, the *Te Deum* was chaunted. The bells rang, the bands played. At night the houses were illuminated. Deputations waited on him; there was much emotion, much noise; there were feasts and surprises. Picture to yourself forty armed priests guarding the approach to the Reverend Dictator's sleeping room! Gioberti was particular about having at least one balcony convenient, and he preferred lodging directly on the public square. Deprive the dear people of a speech, the soft hearted moralist could not.

At Rome he was treated quite as if he were a Giobertian Pope. The civic guard patrolled the street in front of his hotel. Equipages were provided by the nobility. In his honor a street was re-named. Professors and students crowned with laurel and olive "the philosopher who was second to none of his contemporaries." A café was called after him. Ecclesiastics paid court to the patriot. Crowds followed him, cheering, as he paraded the streets pompously. The Pope thrice granted him audience. Pius was not converted; but he gave some good advice to Gioberti. Retract your errors and repair the scandals done to the Church by your writings,—thus the Pope advised the Dictator. But he, going out on the balcony, told the people how well-disposed he found the Pope to the Italian cause, and having relieved himself of many *Evvivas*, passionately thundered against the King of Naples. The homeward journey was a continuous demonstration. Everywhere the Dictator sounded the praises of Charles Albert; and yet, at Genoa, the king's partisan paid a visit of "veneration" to Mazzini's mother, and at Milan he changed his quarters in order that he should be under the same roof with the Carbonaro president. These beautiful actions may have been inspired by a deep sense of the responsibility of the priestly office. When Gioberti's journey

¹ Antoni Rosmini, von Franz Xaver Kraus, *Deutsche Rundschau*, April, 1888, pp. 65-66.

was over, be sure the delirium had not moderated. If the people were more than ever beside themselves, no sane person would be surprised.

Balbo, the popularizer of "Il Primato," a thorough Giobertian, was a prime mover in the anti-Austrian campaign. As chief Minister of the Piedmontese cabinet, he enjoyed the honor of declaring war; and to him the success of the so-called fusion was due. But divisions and disasters proved fatal to him, and he was forced to resign. On July 29th a new ministry was formed with Casati at the head. Gioberti entered the cabinet and was recognized as the real leader. This ministry lived ten days. Gioberti now became the leader of the opposition, a *democrat*. As an "Albertist," he had "stumped" Italy. Within a few weeks he is practically a Mazzinian. He had not changed, of course. Had he not said that he saw no difference between a constitutional monarchy and a republic? To the clubs he now appealed, and he supported the ultras who demanded an immediate renewal of hostilities against the Austrians. The demand was laughable, and, in the true sense of the word, unpopular. In fact, the Lombard people did not desire a war, which was the work of "the unnatural alliance between the aristocratic party and the secret societies." Neither the agricultural nor the middle class loved a lord.¹ The people's opposition to the war was officially established by the Piedmontese general. It was on August 9th that Charles Albert, beaten, secretly dodged out of Milan, and hid himself in Alexandria. Two days later General Salasco signed an armistice with the Austrians. At Turin he was accused of exceeding his powers. His answer is telling: "The people make insurrections, and soldiers fight in wars. Now this was a war, and since the people did not move and gave no sign of acting, and because the soldiers showed themselves disordered and recalcitrant, our only safety lay in a suspension of arms."² Nor did ministers fail to give evidence that even in Piedmont the war was not a people's war. "The soldiers march away Italians and return Austrians," said Perrone, Minister of War. Brofferio, an irreconcilable, with whom Gioberti joined in an attempt to force later ministries to renew the war, confessed in writing, that "the army did not wish war, at any price."³ The "people" of Piedmont and Lombardy escaped the delirium.

Gioberti did not desire war. He was merely using the "law of gradation" so as to overthrow a ministry. The disasters in Lombardy set all the practised tongues in Piedmont wagging. In parliament deputies baited ministers, ex-ministers, and fellow deputies.

¹ Comte de Hubner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 227.

³ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 261, and note.

Balbo, the once "popular" Balbo, felt safe in his seat because of the dagger he carried. To the friends who had glorified him, the "Moral Dictator" proved false. Combating them, he united with the revolutionaries of Rome, Naples, Tuscany. The idea of an Italian Federation was not novel. On Pope and prince, Gioberti had long pushed an artful scheme of his own devising. Now, he adapted his scheme to suit the Mazzinians; and, on October 10th he gathered at Turin a "Federative Congress." The purpose of the Congress was to provide for the "calling of a Constituent Assembly of all the Italian States, the sole authority of the Assembly being to draw up a federal pact which, respecting the existence of each state, and leaving unchanged the forms of government, would serve to assure the liberty, union, and independence of Italy, and to aid the well-being of the nation."¹ A clever scheme! The character of the Congress may be judged from the fact, that the revolutionary clubs everywhere elected deputies and sent them to Turin. Rome was represented by the Bonaparte prince, Canino, with Mamiani and Sterbini. A federal pact fabricated by these three statesmen would have assured the everlasting well-being of any country. The journey of the Roman deputies was like Gioberti's "Albertist" swing around the circle,—noise, emotions, surprises, lies, and feasts. Would that the Congress had not intensified the delirium by methods more criminal!

Only six days before the opening of the Congress, strange to say, a prominent Italian resigned a quasi-mission to which Minister Gioberti had appointed him—a mission to the Pope. The missionary was no less a personage than the Abbate Antonio Serbati Rosmini, who had been negotiating at Rome for a confederation of the Italian states. Rosmini was himself a limited moral dictator, and he tried to play so considerable a part in Italian politics that he deserves more than a passing word. A friendly "Life" of the priest, politician, and philosopher, has been prepared for the benefit of English readers, and we have within reach friendly studies of his philosophical system, and translations of a few of his many books. It is Ausonio Franchi, however, who has presented the latest and the most original criticism of Rosmini's philosophy and politics. The great critic knew Rosmini as well as Gioberti. Laboriously working his way out of Mazzinianism and Rationalism, and year by year correcting his own errors, Ausonio put several contemporary Italian philosophers into the crucible. Coming from a specialist, the results of his analysis are valuable. Until recently, any one who could not admire everything that Rosmini did and wrote, might expect to be called a "jesuit." Ausonio has spoiled the trick.

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 232.

Not far from Trent, in the Austrian Tyrol, at Roveredo, among the vines and the mulberries of the beautiful valley of Lagarina, Rosmini was born in 1797. The Rosmini family were patricians, tracing their lineage back at least four hundred years. According to all accounts, Antonio was an infant phenomenon; "a reflecting child at two years of age, an alms-giving boy at five, a most studious youth at seven, a practical ascetic at twelve, a brilliant moral essayist at sixteen, and such a proficient in philosophy at eighteen that his professor became his disciple; marvellously gifted all his days from the cradle to the grave."¹

Before Antonio had attained the age of five he was *thoroughly* versed in the Sacred Scriptures, his biographer says. From a child so fully equipped at five years of age, what may we not expect when, ceasing perhaps to be a child, he reaches fifty? The possibilities are astounding. A studious and pious youth was Rosmini. At seventeen, he determined to be a priest. Then he began the study of philosophy under Don Pietro Orsi, a graduate of the University of Vienna. Rosmini spent a good portion of one whole year with Don Orsi, and, as we have seen, was teaching Orsi before the year ended. These absorbing philosophical studies did not hinder Antonio from writing "profound reflections on Dante's 'Divina Commedia,' and comments on the 'Monarchia,' which were deemed beyond the powers of one so young and so little acquainted with actual politics."² Nor did the youth rest here. "He wrote *learnedly* on mathematics and literature." At the end of 1816, Antonio entered the University of Padua; six months later, the degree of A.B. was conferred on him, and then he took the tonsure. In 1819, he finished his studies at Padua, and, his father dying, succeeded to the family estate. On April 21, 1821, he was ordained a priest. Even before his ordination, he had given practical proof of a deep interest in education, and the nobility of his own section and of Piedmont invited his assistance in an apostolate of the press. He gladly worked with them, and besides wrote some little books of religious instruction. From 1821 to 1826 Rosmini lived at Roveredo, especially engaged in harmonizing the truths of all the philosophers of all times. He read and wrote much, and engaged in many charitable works. The year 1826 was mostly spent at Milan in the society of literary men, of whom Manzoni was the leader. During this year and the following, the Abbate published several philosophical and educational essays, and, what was of more importance, took the first steps towards founding a religious order—the Institute of Charity.

¹ *Life of Antonio Rosmini Serbati*, edited by William Lockhart. London, 1886. vol. i., p. 11.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 39-40.

Madame Canossa, a friend of the Abbate, who had established at Milan a religious Order of Charity for women, incited him to organize a similar order for men. He hesitated, but at length felt that he was called to the work, and, in February, 1828, opened a small convent at Domo d'Ossola, not far from the Lago Maggiore. During the following year, Rosmini passed through the press, at Rome, the "*Nuovo Saggio on the Origin of Ideas.*" Writing, travelling, teaching,—he served a year as parish priest at Roveredo,—seven years ran by. The convent of Domo d'Ossola was removed to Stresa, on the Lake, in 1836. Not until 1838, did the rule of the Institute of Mercy receive approbation at Rome. From 1839 to 1846, Rosmini remained at Stresa, watching the Institute, receiving the visits of eminent foreigners, carrying on a large correspondence, and, at the same time, *renovating* philosophy. To be the Renovator of philosophy was Rosmini's ambition. He intended "to produce a philosophy which should be nothing less than an encyclopædia of the entire human *knowable—the totum scibile*—conjoined in a grand synthesis, resting on and springing from one most simple principle, and that principle, objective truth itself, evidence itself, or self-evidence." What greater intellectual achievement could he have proposed to himself? his biographer asks. The reader may answer, specifically, if it so pleaseth him.

When first we meet Gioberti and Rosmini together, in public, it is as philosophers. Rosmini was known to the philosophical world ten years before Gioberti, but when the latter had won his spurs he tilted full at the older writer. In the "*Errori Filosofici d' Antonio Rosmini,*" printed in 1841, he resented the claim of the Tyrolese to autocracy in Italian philosophy, and passionately attacked him and his followers. He charged Rosmini with being a rationalist. When the latter made answer, in 1846, he retorted that Gioberti was a pantheist.¹ Neither harmonizer had been harmoniously disposed by the influence of his own system or of his brother philosopher's.

A story told by Father Signini, of the Institute, will indicate certain noteworthy characteristics of Rosmini's mind. "I was walking with him one day in Turin. We were on the Via delle Orfane, near the Church of San Dalmazzo, and he was in deep thought. All of a sudden he turned to me, saying, 'Oh, what would I give to have five minutes talk with St. Thomas! I am sure we should understand one another and perfectly agree.'"² Rosmini meant that St. Thomas should agree with him. And yet we know the Saint could not have agreed with the later Italian philosopher—in his errors. The patience, application, good intentions, talent,

¹ Kraus, *loc. cit.*, p. 52.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. ii., p. 42.

activity of the founder of the Institute are evident; but it is to be regretted that he did not content himself with following St. Thomas instead of competing with him. For he did compete with the great Saint whom he was always lauding. He tried to put himself in the place St. Thomas had for centuries held. What tempted him to aim thus high? We have the explanation in his own words. One evening, while he was studying philosophy with that Don Orsi who knew just little enough to be the pupil of his pupil, Rosmini strolled along a street in Roveredo. Speculating, he fell into a line of thought. By a process of analysis that seemed to him exact, he speedily "became convinced that indeterminate ideal being must be the first truth, the first thing seen by immediate intuition, and the universal means of all acquired knowledge, whether perceptive or intuitive." "A sudden flash of genius, if not a revelation, so illumined his course that he could clearly see 'the open portal of philosophical truth.'"¹ Now it was on this strolling "conviction" of a youth of eighteen—be it flash of genius or revelation—that Rosmini built up his SYSTEM OF TRUTH, as he called it.² "I noted down daily," he writes, "(while Pietro Orsi was my guide) the results of the artless and as yet inexperienced liberty to indulge in philosophical speculations, knowing that I thus stored up seeds which should bud forth in all the after-labors of my life on earth. *In truth, all the productions of my maturer years were the outgrowth of those seeds.*"³ Could anything be more charming in its simplicity than this naive confession? A self-confident youth—and man!

The weakness of the Rosminian system was long ago exposed. Had he studied philosophy under a competent teacher, it is probable that Rosmini would have passed a quieter life. Certainly he would not have wasted much valuable time. Ausonio Franchi makes an admirable comparison between his schooling and methods and those of St. Thomas.⁴ The boy philosopher is the real *enfant terrible*. On the airy basis of "the innate idea of the possible being," Rosmini builded his "Encyclopædia of the entire human knowable—the *totum scibile*." Rightly did Gioberti call the Rosminian principle "a soap-bubble." It was and is vain, most vain; indeed, it is contradictory and absurd, says Ausonio Franchi.⁵ Now, St. Thomas is never absurd. Therefore Rosmini did not understand St. Thomas. What Rosmini needed was five minutes' correction from the Angel of the Schools. And yet he wrote to the Secretary of Cardinal Pacca: "I am persuaded (I beg you not to charge me with presumption, for God knows

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 45, 46; see also pp. 38-39.

² *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 99.

⁴ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 114-117.

³ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 39.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-120.

that I do not dissemble in acknowledging myself unworthy of all favor), I am persuaded that my doctrine is from God, and that he alone communicated it to me, and I say to you also without much employment of human means and through the light of grace."¹ Not a word about the "flash of genius!" It is a revelation that we have to deal with. And yet the system is evidently absurd, and Leo XIII's condemnation of the forty propositions has buried Rosminianism! This sketch of the philosopher seemed necessary in order that, becoming acquainted with the temperament and mental characteristics of the man, we might more intelligently form a judgment on him when we see him in the rôle of a politician.

Only after the accession of Pius IX. to the Papacy did the founder of the Order of the Institute of Charity become publicly active in Italian politics. His close relations with Milan and Turin had favored an intimacy with Manzoni, who was, in fact, brought back from skepticism by association with the Abbate. Manzoni was the father-in-law of Massimo d'Azeglio. With Massimo and his father, Taparelli, Rosmini formed a friendship. The Cavours were welcome guests at Stresa; and there the Neapolitan, Ruggero Bonghi, later deputy and minister of public instruction under the unified Piedmontese administration, enjoyed the society of the agreeable priest, and such advantages as were derivable from a daily contemplation of the prodigiously large and filmy "soap-bubble"—The System of Truth. Silvio Pellico had long been a favorite at the Convent on Lago Maggiore. A Tyrolean had to be careful about expressing anti-Austrian views. However, Rosmini was not pro-Austrian and he was an Italian nationalist and unifier. Can we doubt that he had his own pet schemes for harmonizing all the political views current in Italy? And would it be astonishing if, having imagined himself the elected Renovator of philosophy and the chosen vessel of a philosophical revelation, he should assume that political wisdom had been communicated to him, through the light of grace, and "without much employment of human means?" If Pius IX. had to contend only with the diplomatic Ananias, his troubles would have been hard enough to bear; but think of the added infliction of gratuitous, inspired Prime Ministers—without a portfolio!

As soon as there was talk of a Roman Constitution, Rosmini assumed a confidential position in the Papal Ministry. "One man there was in North Italy," his biographer informs us, "to whom many minds turned at this moment. He had written several volumes on Politics and Constitutional right, and on Constitutional Forms and Parliamentary Government, which had placed him in

¹ *Ibid*, p. 117, note.

the first rank of Italian writers on these subjects. That man was Rosmini.¹ The conclusion is unmistakable. There was "one man" in North Italy who was not only competent but also ready to frame a proper Constitution, not for North Italy, but for the Papal States. At Rome, Rosmini had a friend, Cardinal Castracane. To him the Abbate sent a "Project of a Statute for the States of the Church." Then he wrote letters to the Pope and to his own Procurator. He stated "what he should wish the Pope to do." In answer, he was informed that the Pope had already granted a Constitution. Rosmini was not disheartened. As early as 1832 he had composed a work "on the spiritual liberty of the Church." The MSS. was now taken down from its shelf and printed for the public benefit, and especially for the advantage of the Church. Coming when it did, the *Cinque Piaghe*, or "Five wounds," was admirably calculated to serve all the enemies of the Church, and to embarrass the Pope. "Rosmini talks of the five wounds of the Church," said Gioberti. "I know ten at least." From the day it was published until the present day the "*Cinque Piaghe*" has served "liberal" innovators, who glibly rehash its ill-conceived and preposterous assumptions. In the United States more than one writer has gained the reputation of an original thinker by cribbing out of Rosmini. Theiner, answering the book, charged the author with a want of knowledge of history and of canon law, and with an incredible confusion of ideas with facts.² Cæsaropapism, as Theiner said, Rosmini would have replaced by a Popolopapism, whose lightest chains would be more galling than the heaviest the Church had borne.

After the Papal allocution of April 29th, in which Pius had declared that, "being the common Father of all the Faithful, he could not go to war with any of them," Rosmini felt deeply pained at the Pope's trials, and that at Rome no one had a notion of how to cope with the situation.³ Forthwith he began to communicate with Cardinal Castracane, hoping through him to set the Pope right. "If he, Rosmini, were near Pius IX., he would advise the Pope to join with Naples and Tuscany, and by a collective note warn Austria that if she did not leave the Peninsula, the Pope and his allies, to save their own thrones, would join Charles Albert in an Italian war."⁴ The Pope was much "struck" by this letter, as we learn from Rosmini's biographer. The founder of the Institute of Charity continued to strike the Pope with unheeded advice. His Holiness directed Cardinal Castracane to

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 331.

² Kraus, *loc. cit.*, pp. 72-75.

³ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 336-337.

⁴ See the letter, *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 337-339.

thank the Abbate,¹ who undoubtedly had been more than kind. Having devised a constitution for the Papal States, Rosmini proceeded to formulate a constitution for Italy: *La Costituzione Secondo La Giustizia Sociale, con un Appendice sull' Unità d'Italia*.² A single passage from this work will give an insight into Rosmini's politics and the depth of his political science, "The unity of Italy! Such is the universal cry, and at this cry there is not one Italian heart from the Straits to the Alps that does not palpitate. To prove the utility and necessity of this unity would therefore be to throw words to the winds: where all agree there is no question."³ Transparent, but not so very deep!

While the "one man in North Italy" was thus guiding the Church and the State, Gioberti entered the Piedmontese Ministry. We have heard him threatening to declare Charles Albert king of Rome if the Pope did not combine with Piedmont. We know that Gioberti, like Rossi and others, had a scheme for an Italian league of some sort. Once in power, the "Moral Dictator" lost no time. Piedmont was caught in its own trap. To entrap the Pope was the only hope; there was the League and there was Rosmini. On July 31st, two days after Casati and Gioberti came into power, a messenger was sent to Stresa. On the 2d of August the two philosophers—the rationalist and the pantheist—were conferring about the best means of inducing the Pope to take part in the war against Austria.⁴ The Ministry wished Rosmini to accept a mission to the Pope. The Abbate was willing, provided that his mission "enabled him to treat of all that he judged necessary or useful for the prosperity of Italy and of the Church." We can see the opportune smile on Gioberti's face as he argued in favor of accepting Rosmini's proposal. The Rosminian ideas included a Concordat with the Pope, and a league between Piedmont, Rome, Tuscany and Naples. In Rome a Permanent Diet would sit. Of this Diet and of Italian unity the Pope should be the Protector—"Moral President."⁵

Without any official instructions or credentials, Rosmini started for Rome, where he arrived on the 15th of August. Gioberti was out of the ministry a full week before this date. His brother philosopher, still without credentials, worked conscientiously and hopefully at Rome. When his credentials did arrive, they made no mention of a Confederation of States, nor of a Concordat. However, Rosmini continued to hold conferences over his Confederation. At Turin they had been making game of the founder of

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 334.

² Milan, 1848.

³ *La Costituzione, etc.*, p. 97.

⁴ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 346.

⁵ See the *Life*, vol. i., pp. 347-348; *La Costituzione*, pp. 104-110; Kraus, *loc. cit.*, p. 220.

the Institute of Charity. The Piedmontese meant to have their king—a king of Rome; and neither a diet, nor a pope protector, nor a “moral president.” Pius IX. and his minister Rossi, well knew the Piedmontese, and Rossi opposed the Rosminian scheme; but the eyes of the diplomat of Stresa, who so amusingly undertook a mission that was no mission, were not opened until he received a despatch from Turin, on the 4th of October, saying: “*Let us make a league for the war first; afterwards we will make a Confederation.*”¹ Then Rosmini resigned. Just what he resigned, the reader may have discovered—resigned himself to the circumstances. Meanwhile, the “pantheist” who had used him “opportunist,” was posing as a democrat, and organizing a revolutionary Congress. “This is the way to govern,” said Napoleon the Great as he executed a pirouette. Gioberti could not govern, but, on a small scale, he was a pirouette politician. And Rosmini? Well, founders of orders are not supposed to be skilful in the art of the ballet-dancer.

Rossi, the Pope’s minister, with whom Rosmini had to deal, was a politician, practised, experienced. At the age of thirty, he followed Murat, and had been a more loyal Carbonaro than Mazzini. Exiled, he went to Geneva, where he lectured on law, and soon obtained a place in the University as a lecturer on Roman history. During the revolution of 1830 he went to France. There he made his mark, rising rapidly: professor of constitutional law, member of the Institute, peer, count. Louis Philippe, desirous of influencing Gregory XVI. against the Jesuits, chose Rossi as Plenipotentiary at Rome, and later appointed him ambassador. Residence in the Holy City, association with Gregory, with Pius and with the leading Churchmen, corrected old errors and prejudices. The ambassador cut away from the secret societies with which he had been long affiliated. Of the righteousness of the Pope’s cause and of the iniquity of the Revolution, he became convinced. After Louis Philippe was overthrown, Rossi withdrew from active political life and used his pen and influence in favor of the Papacy.² When Pius IX. selected him to lead the Ministry, many friends of the Pope and all his foes were displeased. Rossi was no reactionist; but he meant to re-establish public order, and to straighten out the finances of the government. He reorganized the army, pursued the thieves and assassins, protected honest citizens, repressed disorder, and soon gave to Rome and the Papal States a peace long unknown. An Italian league Rossi desired, but not an Italian empire under the sovereignty of the house of Savoy. It

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., p. 352.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, pp. 234-238; Van Dueren, pp. 193-194.

was the Pope, as we have seen, who first proposed a league. The revolutionaries and the optimists had worked industriously to popularize the idea of a republic formed of all the peoples of Italy, with the Pope as President. In the Encyclical of April 29th, Pius repudiated this hypocritical scheme. Just one month after Rosmini's "resignation," Rossi stated his own and the Pope's policy, exposing at the same time the un-Italianism of the Turin government, which "by means of the armies and the money of its allies sought to obtain *magnificent accessions*." "Pius IX. asks nothing," wrote the minister, "desires nothing but the happiness of Italy, and the regular development of the institutions which he has given to his people; but he will never forget what he owes to the dignity of the Holy See and to the glory of Rome." Why Italy should be considerate of the dignity of the Holy See, Rossi eloquently told. "The Papacy is the sole living grandeur that remains to Italy. It is the Papacy that draws to Italy the respect and the homage of Europe and of the whole Catholic world. As Pontiff, as a Sovereign, as an Italian, Pius IX. will always bear in mind this fact."¹ Had Rossi been spared, the Piedmontese monarchical unifiers and the democratic revolutionaries would have had to deal with a man of ideas and of decision.

When Rossi penned the words just quoted his fate was sealed. Unity, liberty, order, the Revolution would not hear of. At Gioberti's "Federative Congress" the leaders had condemned the Minister of Pius to death. Meeting a second time at Leghorn, the horrible cut-throats, united at the social banquet-board, had affirmed the condemnation. The Minister was judged according to the "laws" of the Secret Societies—laws whose import we have seen. Not the breast of his mother, not the altar, could have saved him. Mazzini wrote that Rossi's death was *indispensable*. The revolutionary journals hinted broadly at the crime that was to be, and even named the day. Bonaparte of Canino promised openly what quickly came. Thirty and odd "Young Italians," chosen for their hardheartedness, were divided into three sections. Out of each section of villains one was again selected. The story of the three is well known—the corpse laid before them, and each ruffian, in turn, striking with his dagger at the jugular vein. On November 15th the Chambers were to open, and Rossi was ready with his programme. Again and again was he warned; but knowing no fear, and conscious of the rectitude of his cause, the Minister would not hold back. "The cause of the Pope is the cause of God," he exclaimed, as he entered a carriage. Rossi did not know that, through the treachery of Angelo Calderari—still

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.* p. 238, note; *L'Expédition de Rome en 1849, par Leopold de Gaillard*, Paris, 1861, pp. 79-80.

another angel!—colonel of the Papal carbineers, a man who had been thirty-two years in the Papal service, and who had not only acquired rank but riches through the kindness of the Popes, he was wholly at the mercy of sworn assassins. Soldiery, guards, all had been selected to protect, not the Minister but the murderers. Arrived at the *Palazzo della Cancelleria*, he descended from his carriage. A crowd has gathered in the court and on the stairway; they stand close together; Rossi mounts; some one touches him on the shoulder; he turns—the blow was true; he falls in his own blood—the jugular is severed. In a room close by he dies within a few short minutes—time for absolution. The assassin? Not a man laid a hand upon him. He was a hero!¹

Sterbini, and many other deputies, were in the Chambers, expectantly awaiting. An audience of innocents and of adepts chatted in the galleries. Bonaparte enters. Coolly he announces the fact of the murder. The innocents are horrified, and express their horror. "Silence!" says Bonaparte, the anarchist. "Is the *King of Rome* dead, perchance?" The Chambers adjourned without expression of regret or resolution of inquiry. The journals either smothered the news or spoke of the murder as a patriotic act. Mamiani wrote: "The necessity of blood is repugnant to us; but, you other men of power, contemplating the death of the Minister, look to yourselves." In after years, the leaders of the revolution tried to shift from their shoulders the joint responsibility for Rossi's assassination. One charged the other with the whole responsibility. Mazzini, who gloried in murder, and who was not ashamed to give in detail an account of his purchase of Galenga—afterwards the manufacturer for years of the Italian correspondence of the *London Times*—to assassinate Charles Albert—even Mazzini was not desirous of having the undivided credit of Rossi's death. According to the truth-loving Genoese, Mamiani, the ex-minister and philosopher instigated the crime.²

Could the fine art of murder be exercised with a purpose nobler than the stimulation of "delirium?" At once the clubs were in motion. The services of the traitor, Calderari, had not been exhausted. He placed the carbineers at the disposal of the managers. When a "popular demonstration" was on the club-programme, the Civic Guard—protector of Rome—was always convenient. Rossi's murder was celebrated in the cafés. The day was one long feast. At night, the maddened, drunken rabble was marshalled in the streets. Candle in hand, the hoarse-voiced mob

¹ Claudio Januet, *loc. cit.*, pp. 299–300. *La Rivoluzione Romana*, pp. 126–135. Cantu, *loc. cit.*, pp. 241–242. Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 192–194. Kraus, *loc. cit.*, pp. 222–226.

² See Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. i., pp. 349–353, and vol. v., pp. 378–384.

paraded, shouting, "Blessed be the hand that poignarded Rossi!" The assassin was there. Heartless men kissed his hand. The "holy dagger," thus they termed it, fixed to a staff, was lifted on high. Deliriously the inhuman throng, bearing the poignard-staff yelled their awful litany beneath the windows of the woman whom they had just widowed and of the children they had just orphaned.¹ There are "gentlemen" who would abolish Hell. They cannot, before they have passed through its adamantine gates.

Rossi's murder was but a move in the revolutionary game. The Minister dead, officials corrupted or terrified, soldiers at command, the leaders had the Pope at their mercy. The reign of law was at an end. In its place reigned the Popular Club, as Canino, Mamiani, and Sterbini had named the Fiano palace, where they daily conspired. While the rabble consoled the weeping widow, Canino and his intimates were taking means to protect the people of Rome and to direct the government of the Papal States after a proper modern and democratic fashion. All the trusted men were in council. Duly they produced an address to the people. Obeying the "unanimous wish of the country," the Popular Club demanded that the Pope should "promulgate the principles of Italian nationality, convoke a Constituent assembly in accordance with the suggestions of Gioberti's democratic Federative Congress,"² and accept Mamiani's measures for an anti-Austrian war. Long live Italy! Hurrah for the rights of the people!

To carry out this programme a competent ministry was necessary, and, therefore, the "people," unified in the Popular Club, nominated a ministry. The persons chosen should not be forgotten: Mamiani, Sterbini, Galletti, Campello, Saliceti, Fusconi Lunati, Sereni. In the hands of the famous trio of Ananias and Judases, the delirious people were sure of agreeable occupation. On the 16th of November a demonstration was organized at the Club. Shortly after midday, with bands playing and flags waving, a procession of civic guards, carbineers and "people" marched noisily to the Cancelleria. A deputation waited on the Chambers, which appointed a representative committee to accompany the demonstrators. Prince Corsini, Galletti and the veteran Armellini were chosen to present the Club's ultimatum to the Pope. Armellini, who was seventy-five years old, and who had sworn loyalty to the Papacy six several times during his career in the Papal courts, owed his wealth and standing to the favor of the government. Galletti and he should have embraced. Pius IX. was forsaken, were it not for the ambassadors of Spain, France,

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 192-194.

² *La Rivoluzione Romana*, pp. 138-139.

Portugal, Bavaria and Russia, who remained at the Quirinal to support him in his trial. Minto, the agent of Palmerston and of the secret societies, was not with the Pope; nor was Pareto, the representative of Piedmont. The Pope did not receive the Club deputation, and, to gain time, suggested that Galletti undertake to form a new ministry. Pius would consider the names presented to him. The mob was waiting in the Piazza of the Quirinal. Galletti, coming out of the palace, announced the Pope's message, which was received with cries of protest and derision. The demands of the "people" must be granted immediately. Back to the Pope Galletti was sent. Pius was not to be moved. It was his right to select the ministers, he said, and to do this freely. Forced he would not be.

Receiving this answer, the Club proceeded to take the next step agreed upon. Barricades were constructed in the streets leading to the Quirinal. The Piazza was filled with armed men. Cannons were brought out. Soon shots were fired. The Pope's guard was the enemy. The gates of the palace were first battered with stones. Then came the Prince of Canino, who trained a cannon, stamped with the name *San Pietro*,—of all names,—on the residence of St. Peter's successor. Palace, Pope and all the orderly priests in Rome Canino would gladly have blown to pieces. Entering the Duc d'Harcourt's on the evening of the 16th, after a patriotic day's work, the Bonapartist Prince gaily asked the company: "Have you seen the sky?" The heavens were red with the peculiar glow which accompanies the Northern Lights. "The purple of the Cardinals is flying upward," added Canino, cynically. Down in the street the rabble spread the word that a sign was given unto them; the soul of Rossi had been condemned to everlasting flames. Before Canino could have conceived his pretty witticism, he had seen red blood flow at the Quirinal and had watched the red flames as they rose above the palace doors. A Papal secretary was shot. Bullets were deliberately fired through the windows of the Pope's apartment. The Papal guard, attacked while trying to put out the conflagration, sent a volley into the ranks of the insurgents. More than one unfortunate fell.

At night, about nine o'clock, Pius called the foreign ambassadors, and said to them that, "rather than a single drop of blood should be shed in his cause, he would submit to everything that had been demanded."¹ He submitted to force, as he called the ambassadors to witness, and, therefore, he submitted under protest. Then he sent for Galletti, the smirking, faithless conspirator, and accepted his ministry. Galletti informed the Pope that the

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 233.

ruling powers had changed the personnel of the ministry within a few hours. They had chosen Rosmini to hold the portfolio of Public Instruction. A minister of Public Instruction! One should not laugh at the acts of these men. Playing a farce, they were always in dead earnest. It is the tragi-comedian that has made and still makes the people pay in blood and cash for their political instruction.

The founder of the Institute of Charity, it will be remembered, came to Rome on a self-appointed mission of the very first class. He had charged himself with "all that he judged necessary or useful for the prosperity of Italy and of the Church." The fiction of a diplomatic appointment on behalf of the Piedmontese monarchy, even the vanity of Rosmini could not keep alive longer than the 4th of October. And yet here he is in Rome, six weeks later. Why is he in Rome rather than at Stresa? Doubtless because of his conviction that he is the "one man," not only in North Italy, but indeed in the whole of Italy, who can right a crooked world. Rosmini knew that his patent Constitution would have fixed the Pope on the throne and that the Rosminian "Federation" would have pacified all the princes and peoples. But as the Papal advisers had been so short-sighted as to reject both his schemes, what could the good man do other than remain in Rome, and try, through the special graces vouchsafed to him, to save Pope and people from worse mistakes than had been made? Of Rosmini's loyalty to the Pope, honesty of purpose, good will, there can be no doubt; but he was not fitted, by nature or training, for practical politics. He could have written admirable parlor-essays on Civil Service Reform. The men with whom Pius IX. had to deal were too deep for the charitable, simple Abbate. Rosmini's biographer says that, before Rossi's murder, the Pope "must have discovered that the Rossi ministry could not stand, *for*, on October 16th, we find it noted in Rosmini's diary that Monsignor Stella, the Pope's Cameriere and Confessor, was sent by his Holiness to inform him that he intended to make him Secretary of State." Perhaps it is the loose arrangement of the pronouns in this quotation that gives it an oracular character. Certainly Pius IX. did not suggest Rosmini's name for any cabinet office, after Rossi's death. However, the biographer further informs us that, dining with the Pope, by invitation, in the Vatican Gardens, the Pope told Rosmini that he meant to create him Cardinal in the Consistory of December.¹ Rosmini did not decline the honor. Indeed he made every preparation to receive it in a dignified manner, purchasing carriages that would not be unbecoming to a real Cardi-

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 353, 354.

nal.¹ This unofficial "appointment," Pius IX. continued to reserve *in petto*; and we are not surprised. Rosmini did not interrupt the gratuitous admonition which he had long vouchsafed to Pius. December was near at hand. A Cardinal that was to be, might as well remain where the Cardinals customarily resided. Oddly enough, the revolutionary insurgents offer him the leadership of a ministry, not a mere Diary ministry but a live ministry. Why did Galletti, Mamiani, Sterbini and Canino choose the founder of the Institute of Charity as an agent? There were points on which he and they partly agreed. He desired a federation, so did they; he favored a war against Austria, and so did the revolutionaries. Rosmini might fairly be termed a liberal. He was not in any sense of the word, an intentional revolutionary. Not a few hours before the presentation of his name to the Pope, the insurgents had adopted several important measures. The Popular Club met, declared the country in danger, and appointed itself a Committee on Public Safety. All good citizens were notified that, hereafter, rules and regulations proceeding from the assassins' club should be accepted as "representing the true and absolute will of the people." The army officers as well as those of the Civic Guard acknowledged the club's authority, and so did Colonel Stuart, commander at St. Angelo. The Chambers were advised of the new régime, and requested to consult with the actual government. Sterbini lent a hand to Bonaparte at the Quirinal, and the Papal Guard had notice that if the "popular" demands were not quickly gratified, the Palace would be bombarded and every one within put to the sword.² At this juncture it was that Rosmini received the honor of a nomination to the Presidency of the Council, with the portfolio of Public Instruction. Desirous of knowing the Pope's will in the matter, the Abbate "sent to the Holy Father to know if it was his wish that Rosmini should accept this office, for he did not know whether he had been named by the Pope, or only included in the programme presented by the revolutionists." Pius left Rosmini quite free, answering: that "on the one hand he should be pleased if Rosmini accepted the charge, because he would have in him a bulwark; on the other hand, he did not know whether Rosmini would be able to resist his colleagues, or would rather be crushed by them."³ From this politely careful reply, the Abbate "understood that the Pope did not oblige him to accept," and promptly resigned. To the ministers he wrote, that, "since the Pope was not free, the nomina-

¹ *Life of Rosmini*, vol. ii., p. 26.

² *La Rivoluzione*, pp. 143-154.

³ *The Life of Rosmini*, vol. i., pp. 355-357.

tions were unconstitutional, and therefore he refused absolutely to form part of the Ministry." The next day Rosmini left the city.

As soon as the Pope accepted Galletti's nominations, the miscreants in the Piazza ceased their preparations for an assault. Deliriously they shouted; "Long live Pius IX. *alone!* Brotherhood and Union!" Then they forced householders to illuminate their windows. Decent people passed another night of terror. The Popular Club discharged the Papal Guard and committed the Pope's person to the tender care of the Civic Guard. Pius IX. was a prisoner. Villains of every degree and nationality were at the back of Bonaparte, Sterbini, Galletti. The Cardinals were not safe. To preserve their lives, one by one they slipped out of the Holy City. Day after day the position of Pius IX. was rendered more and more painful. His power had been usurped. The Chambers did not communicate with him. The Club was the Government. Surrounded by spies and assassins, at the mercy of malefactors who preserved his life only because they hoped, by conveniently threatening it, to force him to consent to their socialistic schemes, there was only one way left to the Pope of saving his dignity, his rights, and the rights of the Church. Convinced by the arguments of the foreign ambassadors and by his own experience and reason, Pius determined to foil the conspirators. On the night of November 25th, clad as a simple priest, he escaped his guards, entered a four-wheeler, and was soon out of the city and on the road to the Neapolitan frontier.

When the Popular Club discovered that the prisoner had escaped, more than one of the leaders must have recalled the words spoken by the Pope on the 11th of February preceding: "If ever—and pray God it may not be—an attempt be made to do violence to my will, to force my rights from me, if ever I see myself abandoned by the men I have so loved and for whom I have done everything, I shall throw myself into the arms of Providence, and Providence will not fail me." Pius had thrown himself into the arms of Providence and Providence did not fail him. But the Ananiases! Though many of them lie now in the tomb, their heirs are still plying the diplomatic avocation. The Church, Providence has never failed, will never fail. Still no man has found out its ways. On the morning of the 25th Pius arrived at Gaeta. Every Pope, under all circumstances, has protected the Sovereign rights of the Papacy. Two days after reaching Gaeta, Pius IX. issued a public protest against the illegal acts of the revolutionaries. "Solemnly we protest that we have been oppressed by violence, and therefore we declare all the acts consequent on violence null and of no value, of no legal force." Acting as the Sovereign of the Roman States, he nominated a Commission

which, during his absence, should govern according to his instructions. And to the revolutionaries he spoke words of bitter truth and of charitable warning. "There is a class of perverse men," said Pius, "who, in the face of Europe, have covered themselves with the stains of ingratitude; worse still, they are marked with the blot which an angry God has impressed upon their souls; a God, who, sooner or later, executes the chastisements pronounced by the Church." A Pope at Gaeta is the Pope. God is always and everywhere. The Church is God's Church.

JOHN A. MOONEY.

EARLY CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM.

THE word *Symbol*, meaning literally, "that which is taken with," denotes, in its widest signification, an object by which through the sense of sight, some particular idea is suggested, awakened, and impressed upon the mind. When we pass in review the primitive monuments of Christianity, and especially the numerous remains taken from the Roman catacombs, we are immediately struck by the continual repetition of certain mysterious signs, characters, and, we might say, hieroglyphics, which are evidently meant to excite attention to some matter of faith or morals. This is early Christian sign-painting or symbolism. Sometimes, persons and events of the Old Testament are brought into relation with corresponding ones of the New Testament; sometimes, figures taken from the fables of paganism, such as Orpheus taming, by the sweetness of his music, the wild beasts that gathered around him; or Ulysses, turning a deaf ear to the melodious incantations of the Sirens, are ingeniously diverted to point a moral to the Christian observer; at other times, it is from pastoral life, or from that of the agriculturist and the fisherman, that the sacred symbol is taken. But the richest source of early Christian symbolism is found in a circumscribed circle of objects, whether real or chimerical, such as a bird, a fish, a dragon, the phoenix, the centaur, or a flower, a tree, an anchor, a crown. All these, and many more, now one of which the early Christian artist, who worked under strictly hieratic rules, was allowed to assume at pleasure, have been represented in a variety of ways upon the monuments of Christian antiquity, from the tomb of a pontiff-martyr to an insignificant

little brooch or lamp. Clement of Alexandria, writing of figures proper to be engraved upon a Christian's finger ring, says: "Let our signs be, a dove, or a fish, or a ship sailing before the wind, or a musical lyre such as Polycrates¹ used, or an anchor which was on the signet of Seleucus; and if one be a fisherman, let him remember the Apostle and children taken out of the water."

From this passage we legitimately infer that symbols were in common use among the Christians of the second century, and that—whatever their origin—a new and a religious sense was now attached to them. Indeed, we may affirm that the monuments of early Christian ages exhibit a vast system of symbolism, constituting a hidden or hieroglyphical language, capable of expressing by conventional signs the principal mysteries of religion. These symbolical images, especially those cut or moulded on lamps, rings, and other portable objects of domestic or personal use, were all so many tokens of recognition among the faithful; a motive for their use, besides the fostering of individual piety, being the veil of secrecy which Christians were then obliged to assume for their own safety and for the honor of holy things. Yet further, we would insist that this ingenious symbolism was deliberately contrived and intended as an easy and pious mode of instructing the young, the simple, the illiterate, the ignorant. It has been said, reproachfully, that the early Christians took their symbols, in great part, from the Jews, and through them from the Egyptians and other Orientals; and that paganism even furnished a constituent part of it. Granting this, to some extent, and principally for the sake of argument, we answer, that there would be nothing improper in such a course, because it is the intention with which a certain sign is employed, and the conventional meaning attached to it by those who employ it, which determines its sense. Surely, we need not go back to Moses, who, as the Scriptures tell us, "was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," or to the prophets, who spake in the rich imagery of the East, in order to find a sanction for the employment of symbolical language; for, our Blessed Lord himself constantly made use of allegorical speech and of symbolical figures. Let us remark here, that we write only of early Christian symbolism, of such, namely, which has been described by very ancient writers of the Church, or has been discovered on very ancient monuments, because it would be too vast a subject to include in one article that rich

¹ Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, was the patron of the lyric poet Anacreon. Seleucus, founder of the Greco-Syrian monarchy, was obliged to maintain a powerful navy to protect his long stretch of sea-coast. By "the Apostle" is meant Saint Peter, and allusion is made to the words addressed to him by our Lord after the miraculous draught of fishes: "From henceforth thou wilt catch men." (Luke v., 10.)

and wonderful class which may be called Gothic or mediæval symbolism, and which flourished on all sorts of monuments from the fall of the Roman empire to the revival of the arts in the fifteenth century. This, of course, is a very interesting branch of Christian symbolism, but should be treated under the Christian archæology of the Middle Ages, and begins with the very curious and often rudely illustrated treatise entitled *Physiologus* in Latin, and rendered by *Bestiare* in the magnificent "Mélanges d'Archéologie" of Cahier and Martin.

The symbols used by the early Christians either originated with them, or were borrowed from other sources and turned to a new and better meaning. Sometimes animals are found represented on the tombs of Christians, as a sort of *cauting* term (to use an expression of modern heraldry), by which the name of the deceased was indicated; thus a sow has been found on the tomb of a certain *Porcella*, an ass on that of *Onager*, a goat on that of *Capriola*. These names of lowly animals were sometimes assumed, and their figures ordered to be cut on their tombs out of a spirit of humility, as inscriptions testify. They were mostly, however, the names of slaves. Let us now descend to particulars, and indicate the principal symbols found upon ancient Christian monuments, and to which a uniform sense was always attached, so that any one of them was equally understood by the learned and the unlearned—by the Latin, the Greek, the Syrian, the Gaul, and the (converted) Barbarian.

The lamb is taken as a symbol, sometimes of Our Lord, and sometimes of a simple Christian or follower of our Lord. Since the special character of the Redeemer was that of Victim, the earliest and most numerous testimonies in the Sacred Scriptures speak of him under this figure. Thus, in Genesis, and in the prophecies of Isaias, and of Jeremias. St. John the Baptist alluded to Him under this figure; and the same figure is employed by St. Peter and St. John. This figurative manner of speech passed at once into the language of the Church, as is shown from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, and other ancient writers. In the first place, it recalled to the minds of the faithful the great truth that Our Saviour shed His blood on the Cross, without subjecting so sacred a subject to the ridicule of heathens, against which Christians were secretly warned by the Discipline of the Secret, called *Disciplina Arcani*. We may thus look upon the lamb taken as a symbol of Christ, to have been the Crucifix of the early Christians, and in following the various phases or manners of representation we see that gradually the figure melts away into the undisguised Cross.

The oldest manner of representing Christ under this symbol

was a lamb standing upon a hill or mountain, whence flowed four streams of water. It is frequently found upon the bottom of those gilded glass vases used in the *Agapæ* or Love Feasts of the early Christians, and upon their sarcophaguses or stone coffins. These, although a class of monuments comparatively more recent than the gilded vases, often show us, from the larger space the artist had to work upon, some interesting peculiarity, which serves to illustrate or to emphasize a collateral text of Scripture or a mystery of religion, as when, for instance, on a lamp discovered at Marseilles, two harts (deer) are seen refreshing themselves at the water that flows from underneath the feet of the lamb. Another class is that of the lamb bearing one or other pastoral attribute, as the milk-pail (*mulctra*), the crook (*pedum*), where we recognize unmistakably the Good Shepherd. The *Nimbus*, called in art the Halo or the Glory, is, in connection with figures of animals, exclusively used on the Lamb, as representing our Lord. In a number of ancient monuments, the lamb figures in such combinations as prove the intent of the artist, or rather of the Church instructing and directing the artist, to protest against some prevalent dogmatic error, as when after the outbreak of the Arian heresy, representations multiplied of our Lord in person, seated with the right hand uplifted in the attitude of teaching, and having a lamb at his feet, by which were symbolized the two natures: Uncreated, Eternal, Divine Wisdom—the *Logos*, or Word of God—and the Victim which could suffer and die to redeem mankind. But such a dogmatic intention, suggested by a passing error, is not the most usual one. The lamb was far oftener represented so as to keep before the eyes and impress on the minds of the faithful the sufferings of the Innocent One who died for them. Consequently, as little by little the Church developed the mystery of the Cross to the outward senses, the lamb is found with some indication of suffering, as when over the head of the lamb was shown the monogram of Christ, which was a disguised cross. In the sixth century we see the lamb supporting a cross-tipped staff—the *Crux Hastata*,—and sometimes we see the lamb reposing on a book, the mystical sealed Book of the Apocalypse. At a later period the lamb is “standing as it were slain” upon an altar, at the foot of a precious and ornamented cross—*Crux Gemmata*. Again in the same century streams of blood issued from the wounded limbs and opened side of the lamb. In some very ancient mosaics described by Ciampini, the precious Blood flowing from the side is received into a chalice, and from the foot of this and from the four feet of the lamb flow five streamlets, which again come together to form one river of life. In these most singular mosaics we see, doubtless, the first public expression of devotion to the Sacred Heart

and to the Five Wounds of Jesus, and we have also before our eyes a suggestion of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Seven Sacraments. Finally, towards the decline of the sixth century, a lamb is depicted or represented attached to the cross at the place where soon the Man of Sorrows will appear in human form, and the modern Crucifix will be revealed. Nevertheless, it was still customary, up to the tenth century and long after a human figure hung on the cross, to represent a lamb either at its foot or on the reverse. From this period down through the Middle Ages, the symbols of lowliness and of suffering are abandoned, and the lamb is accompanied with those of victory and triumph, as when the lamb supports a cross-shaped banneret called Standard of the Resurrection, or is encircled by a golden zone, to represent the divine power of the Saviour, as described by the prophet Isaias, "And justice shall be the girdle of his loins." Another peculiar form of symbolism is when the lamb is shown armed with a cross, and repelling a serpent, who represents the Evil One, the whole representation being drawn from this passage of the Apocalypse: "These shall fight with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them." In some cases the lamb is armed with a lance instead of a cross, and it has been suggested that as this weapon was, even among the heathens, as in figures of Pallas, or Minerva, a symbol of Wisdom personified, it may have been taken by Christians to represent their Lord overcoming the guile of the serpent by the wisdom of God. Finally the latest representations of the lamb as a symbol of Christ the Redeemer occur in the magnificent mosaics of the eighth and ninth centuries. These are ordinarily set in what are technically called in basilican architecture Triumphal Arches, which is that part of ancient church edifices separating the nave from the transept. The lamb is here represented as in the vision of the Apocalypse, resting upon a glorious throne, around which are four angels and seven candlesticks. At the corners of the arch are the four animals of Ezechiël, each with his book, and a little lower down the four and twenty elders stand, robed in white and holding crowns in their hands.

Coming now to consider the lamb as a symbol not of Christ but of Christians, we may quote the words of Northcote and Brownlowe in *Roma Sotteranea*: "It cannot be necessary to appeal to any authority beyond the discourses of our blessed Lord himself to justify us in saying that a lamb or sheep represented one of Christ's fold." As a symbol of Christians taken collectively, that is, as a symbol of the whole body of the faithful, it is frequently found on the fragments of gilded glass, on sepulchral stones, and later on mosaics. Here two lambs are represented issuing out

of two cities, and hastening towards another lamb standing on a mount. Sometimes these two cities have their names inscribed over them—Jerusalem, Bethlehem—and stand for the converts from Judaism and the converts from Gentilism. At other times, instead of the names of the cities, are found the indications: *Ecclesia ex Circumcisione*, the Church of the Circumcision, that is, Jerusalem; and *Ecclesia ex Gentibus*, the Church of the Gentiles, which is Bethlehem, because there, at the Epiphany or Manifestation, the Divine Infant—Incarnate God—was adored by the Wise Men or Magi. Here also we perceive an allusion to the fraternal union of these two antagonistic peoples in the love of the same Christ: "For He is our peace, who hath made both one," as St. Paul writes to the Ephesians. Sometimes the lamb is represented on early tombs and in ancient paintings, to signify the meekness, humility and innocence that should distinguish the followers of Christ. In this tropological sense the lamb is often found on early monuments, as witness those figures of females called *Orantes*, who, with outstretched arms (a disguised symbol of the cross), stand between two lambs—natural expressions of innocence—which is interpreted to mean that petitions and praises from pure hearts are acceptable to God, but that there can be no graces except through the virtue of the Cross. Sometimes, also, a lamb accompanied with the word *Innocens* or *Innocentissimus* indicates the tomb of some infant or child who has died soon after baptism. As a special symbol, also, of purity or freedom from the lusts of the flesh, the lamb is represented between two wolves, or other ferocious beasts. Two lambs, face to face, having a cross in the form of the Monogram, or a vase full of fruits or of ears of grain, indicate the tomb of husband and wife: in the former instance when they have been disappointed of issue; in the latter case when their union has been fruitful. The *Ram* is not to be confounded with the lamb or the sheep, but has a distinct rôle in Christian symbolism, founded on that passage of Genesis in which, after Abraham had given evidence of his faith and obedience, a ram caught by the horns in the briars was substituted for the sacrifice of Isaac. The ram is therefore a symbol of Jesus Christ, who substituted himself for sinners, and St. Prosper sees here a special image of our Lord crowned with thorns. At a later period in ancient Christian art the sacrificial idea is more particularly conveyed by two rams *affrontés* with a Cross between them, which was a common decoration of the capitals of columns in early churches. In a secondary sense, the ram, which defends the lambs from harm, is, says St. Ambrose, commenting on the Forty-third Psalm, a symbol of Christ overcoming the devil; and since the Christian has strength to resist the Evil One through Jesus Christ, the ram is found on monuments relating to

baptism, and on finger rings dating from the ages of persecution. Indeed, St. Ambrose tells us that we should, like rams, overturn our infernal foes, relying on the strength of Our Lord, of Whom the horn is a figure, as in the Forty-third Psalm, sixth verse: "Through Thee we will push down our enemies with the horn."

Since the Scriptures frequently employ the deer, stag, hart or hind to convey certain moral ideas, the early Christians represented this animal in their monuments with a symbolical intention. According to its several special qualities it was looked upon as a symbol of Our Lord by Saint Ambrose; of the Apostles by Saint Jerome; of preachers, doctors of truth, of the faithful in general, by Cassiodorus; of the saints by Origen; finally of penitents. For instance, one idea drawn from the timidity and swiftness of the deer, was that the Christian must fear and shun the moral dangers—proximate occasions of sin—that menace the soul. Certain symbols being for the first time introduced or having already been received, obtained a special interpretation on the appearance of particular errors; thus the flying hart was used at a certain period as a protest against the heretical severity of the Catharys who taught that it was not lawful for a Christian to seek to escape from persecution, although our Lord said: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another." Tertullian adopted this error and seems indirectly to attest the use of the symbol: "I have known some of their pastors to be lions in times of peace and deer in times of persecution."

Saint Ambrose adopts the deer as a symbol of virgins, applying it especially to Saint Thecla, the first of her sex who suffered martyrdom and defeated the dragon, as the deer drawing its slender feet together leaps upon and kills the venomous coiled serpent. The deer was also regarded by the early Christians as a symbol of mutual assistance, from the alleged fact of natural history that in crossing wide and rapid streams the deer enter the water in a long strong line, each one, except the leader, resting his head upon the flanks of the one before him; and that when the leader is exhausted he falls to the rear to find a support, and thus all cross over in safety. As a symbol the deer has been found in the oldest catacombs, on extremely ancient lamps, on very early tombs and in mosaics. It was particularly associated with baptism, from the touching words of the psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the fountains of waters, so my soul panteth after thee, O God." Thus in a painting discovered in the subterranean cemetery of *San Ponziano*, which goes back to the seventh century, a deer fixes his gaze upon the river Jordan with an expression of intense longing after its refreshing waters. The Horse, either standing still or in motion, and sometimes decorated

with a palm attached like a waving plume to the side of his head is frequently observed on early Christian monuments. Antiquarians have thought that, when without any other adjunct, it was taken as a symbol suggested by Saint Paul's epistle, in which human life is likened to a race; and when the palm is attached, as a graceful ornament to the head, it is the symbol of a swift martyrdom.

Although the Hare is often found on sepulchral slabs, earthenware lamps and precious stones, its exact symbolical meaning is not clear; but from the study of other things found in connection with it, it has been supposed to convey the same idea as the horse. Perhaps the smaller and more delicate of these animals was considered more appropriate for the tombs of and the articles used by women and children; either animal symbolizing the Christian's race to reach the goal, as in the words of Saint Paul: "So run that you may obtain." In confirmation of this common idea, the horse and the hare are sometimes represented as running side by side. Twice on the tombs of children the hare is represented nibbling at a cluster of grapes; and it has been suggested that this harmless little creature symbolized the innocent soul of the child enjoying the pleasures of Paradise which was represented in Christian allegorical and figurative paintings and bas reliefs as a garden of delight; although even here the primary idea of running in the race so as to obtain is obviously kept in view. From the fact that the hare is so frequently found on Christian lamps there must have been some special meaning attached to it in this connection; and it has been suggested that if, on the one hand, there is in this domestic utensil the idea of *watching* (which at once recalls our Lord's parable of the wise and foolish virgins) on the other we must see in this alert and nimble little animal which was said to sleep with one eye open, a symbol of *vigilance* and of promptness to answer, and run forward to meet the bridegroom.

Again the *hare* pursued by the *hound* was sometimes used,—cameos and intaglios with this subject upon them of early Christian possession having been discovered,—to signify the pagan persecutions; whereas the juxtaposition of a *ram* and a *hare*, such as is sometimes found on the bas-reliefs of ancient baptismal fonts, is supposed to signify that, in the battle of life, the conflict between grace and nature, to which (concupiscence surviving after baptism) the neophyte was subject, some temptations are to be boldly met—yea, in the laudable exercise of Christian perfection, may even be voluntarily approached—but that others are to be shunned and fled from, which recalls the epigrammatic saying of that master of the spirit, St. Philip Neri, that in temptations of the flesh cowards are conquerors.

The Lion was taken by the ancients as a symbol of strength and

watchfulness, this quality being attributed to him because he was supposed to sleep with both eyes open—for which story Pliny's Natural History is probably responsible. Solomon, after King David's instruction, made lions of silver and gold for the temple at Jerusalem; but, perhaps,—from the more general idea connected with this king of beasts, of royal pomp and of fierceness, so opposed to the lives of those early and fervent disciples of Him who said: "Learn of Me, because I am meek and humble of heart,"—this figure is very seldom found on primitive Christian monuments. In mediæval archæology, however, the lion is a very common symbol, being constantly found at church porches, on episcopal chairs, on the *ambones* or pulpits whence the Scriptures were read, and on the candlesticks, and especially the paschal candlesticks, which were usually of immense size and of great beauty of design and material in bronze or marble or incrustated stone work. Travellers in Europe must have seen at the porches of some very old churches two lions—one on either side of the entrance—of whom one is represented playfully holding a child in its paws, whereas the other is angrily tearing a porcupine or other "small deer" with its fangs; in the first is symbolized the tenderness of pastors towards those young in the faith; in the second the avenging hand of pastors on contumacious and scandalous sinners, hence the *porcupine*, which was not supposed to keep its wickedness to itself as some other nasty animals do, but to be aggressive and discharge its fretful quills at passers by.

The Calf is often represented on the capitals of columns, particularly in very ancient churches. It was a symbol of Jesus Christ under the sacrificial idea of *Priest* and *Victim*, hence it accompanies the figure of Saint Luke the Evangelist, and of Christians as typifying guilelessness, and seems to have been suggested, in this sense, by the text of Saint Peter, in the Introit of the Mass for Quasimodo or Low Sunday: "As new-born babes desire rational milk without guile." It is mentioned by both Clement of Alexandria and Saint Ambrose.

The Serpent was taken by the early Christians as a symbol in three different senses. First, in sign of the victory of our Lord over the ancient dragon, in which sense it is not anterior to the reign of Constantine the Great. The serpent is thenceforward represented on gems and other small objects, coiled at the foot of the Monogram of Christ (which, as we have remarked, was a disguised form of the Cross), and later at the foot of the cross itself, expressing in the words of the Preface of the Passion: "That life might arise from that which produced death, and that he who conquered by wood, by wood also might be overcome;" a plain allusion to the serpent in the garden tempting Eve.

The once well-nigh universal tree and serpent worship, sprang from a perverted tradition of the Fall of man. Hence the serpent was in a particular manner the outward sign and symbol of idolatry; and although used in this sense with prudence and moderation at first (for the decisive overthrow of idolatry took place in the Roman empire only long after the triumph of the first Christian emperor); it was carried at a later period—as in the public and annual processions of the greater litanies, in a group with the cross—to represent death, and a paschal banner, to represent the resurrection. Secondly, a serpent was used by the early Christians, instructed in the word of our Lord: “Be ye therefore wise as serpents,” as a symbol of that cardinal virtue of prudence, without which, as Saint Bernard says, every other virtue would become a vice; and as this virtue is the fundamental one of good government, bishops were represented framed, as it were, within the encircled figure of a serpent, just as in the middle ages a serpent often formed the volute or curve of a prelate’s pastoral staff. Thirdly, the serpent was a symbol of the cross itself—by a sort of antithetical or associated or suggestive idea taken from the words of our Lord: “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” Its use in this sense was not long retained on account of the errors of the Ophites—or Serpent Worshipers—the Nicolaites, Gnostics and Manichees; and the numerous talismans, amulets and other minute objects on which this reptile figures are the remains of the followers of Basilides. Among the faithful the serpent was sometimes used as a symbol of the resurrection and of immortality, the habit of changing or sloughing its skin and of emerging from a mean state into a brighter and better one, easily explaining the reason. On the monuments of Egypt a serpent holding its tail in its mouth, thus forming a circle, was the sign of unbroken time or eternity.

Birds, real or chimerical, were frequently represented in painting, sculpture, mosaic, embroidery and on a great variety of early Christian monuments; generally, however, as mere ornaments. Sometimes, though, it is impossible—especially when we connect the representation with certain passages of Scripture or the Fathers—not to recognize a symbolical intention in lieu of an ornamental design. Thus the numerous representations in ancient Christian art—far down in the catacombs—of little birds disporting themselves amidst flowers and fruits are unmistakably a symbol of the souls of the faithful escaped from the trials and temptations of this world and now enjoying the delights of paradise; and we can cite here the figurative words of the Psalmist: “Our soul hath been delivered as a sparrow out of the snare of the fowlers. The

snare is broken and we are delivered." This symbolical interpretation is confirmed by the fact which has been verified that on slabs closing the subterranean graves of the dead the number of birds represented—painted, scratched or insculptured thereon—always corresponds exactly to the number of persons buried therein; one soul to each individual; one bird which represents in a material form that spiritual substance of each which springs from this world into the next to join the heavenly choir.

Birds confined in cages, representations of which have been found on paintings, bas-reliefs and gilded vases, are supposed to have symbolized the human soul within the prison of this material body, and also the confessors of the faith and the martyrs confined and tortured by their cruel captors.

Few early Christian monuments show us the eagle, although it was a common symbol in mediæval archæology. There can be no doubt, however, from the words of Saints Ambrose and Maximus of Turin and of other ancient Fathers commenting especially upon this verse of the 102d Psalm: "Thy youth shall be renewed like the eagle's," that this bird was used as a symbol sometimes of the resurrection of the dead, and at other times of the renewal of the life of grace in the soul dead to sin. Thus Saint Maximus of Turin takes the eagle which periodically moults its feathers as a symbol of the neophyte whose life is renewed in baptism. In heaven both body and soul will be renewed by glory, as here below the soul only is by grace renewed; hence in a very ancient painting in the subterranean cemetery of Priscilla two eagles are represented together upon the same globe.

The Cock figures very frequently upon early Christian remains, but especially on the tombs of the dead. It was taken as a symbol of the resurrection or awakening to a new life after the darkness of this world, because it is chanticler's shrill clarion that announces the dawn of day. On sepulchral slabs this bird is represented in connection with certain formulas which leave no doubt of a symbolical intention. *In pace; Bene resurges; Surgatis pariter beati*, this on the *Titulus* of a husband and wife. It was also a symbol of vigilance. Hence when the Christians began to multiply churches above ground, the cock was often placed on the summit of the building to represent the vigilance of pastors turning alternately in every direction. It is especially taken by Saints Eucher and Gregory the Great as a symbol of preachers who announce amidst the darkness of error the truth which came from Him who is the true light of the world, and they quote the words of Job: "Who gave the cock understanding?" As a symbol of watchfulness and intelligence this bird belongs especially to the archæology of the middle ages. On some very

old sepulchral slabs two cocks are represented with lowered heads in the attitude of fighting; and it is supposed that they were then a symbol of tenacious courage and used to signify that those there buried had fought the good fight against the world, the flesh and the devil. This interpretation is rendered certain when a palm branch, as is sometimes the case, is associated with them. The Peacock, which, as Pliny observes, renews its elegant tail feathers with the spring, and the mythical Phœnix which was fabled to rise again from its own ashes, are found occasionally on ancient Christian monuments, and were unmistakably symbols of the resurrection; and the latter bird is so often found in connection with Saint Paul that it cannot be a mere accident, coincidence or ornament, but a symbolical tribute to that Apostle who in his Epistles and in the Acts spoke so eloquently of this consoling doctrine.

There is no other symbol except—as we shall see further on—that of the Fish, which is so frequently used by the early Christians, as that of the Dove. It appears on every species of monument, mural painting, mosaics, sepulchral slabs, lamps, candelabra, cameos, rings, brooches, and ornamented or gilded glass. We know how the dove figures in the Sacred Scriptures. Ancient baptistries were decorated with the figure of a dove—sometimes of solid gold—suspended from the ceiling, so that, with wings expanded, when gently swayed by the wind, it seemed to brood over the sacred font; as in Genesis, “And the spirit of God moved over the waters.” Our Lord, himself, proposed the dove to us as a symbol of simplicity; and the early Christians took it, besides, as an emblem of chastity, humility, meekness, and innocence in general. Sometimes, but rarely, the dove was intended as a symbol of our Lord, for the Greek word for this bird gives, if considered numerically—that is, taking the numerical value attached by the Greeks to each letter—the same sum that Alpha and Omega do; also, these two letters are never applied to any one else but to Him; and, if this sounds a little fanciful, the discovery in the very ancient catacomb of St. Catherine at Chiusi, in Italy, of a dove holding an olive slip in its beak and having a cross over its head, puts the symbol in a more certain light, and expresses the meaning of St. Paul to the Colossians, “Pacifying by the blood of the Cross the things which are on earth or in heaven.” The dove was also a symbol of the Christian soul; and a very ancient seal not only attests this, but indirectly, also, attests the sacred character of the Canticle of Canticles, which would not have been commonly read by the faithful, much less would its words have been used in a spiritual sense, were it reckoned among the *apocrypha*. On this seal a dove is represented with these words beautifully engraved around it, “*Veni si amas*,” “Come, if

thou lovest," which expresses, in almost identical words, the appeal of the Divine Spouse to the devout soul, "Arise, my dove, and come." (ii., 10.)

The Fish is very often mentioned by the Holy Fathers, and other early Christian writers, and is found innumerable times on ancient Christian monuments. It was a symbol, first, of our Lord, and secondly, of his followers. How, when, and by whom the happy idea was struck out that the Greek for fish, ἰχθύς, was a symbolical word of the greatest importance in the Christian sense, is unknown, although there is some reason for believing that it was discovered at Alexandria, celebrated from the very beginning for the number and intelligence of the faithful, and was first suggested by the initial letters of certain Sybilline verses. Observe, that this word represents the sum of Christian theology concerning our Lord: His name, His two-fold nature, His place among the Divine Persons of the Trinity, His priesthood, His redemption: Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Θεοῦ, Υἱός, Σωτήρ—Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour.

We cannot do better than quote the words of Northcote and Brownlow, in the second volume of "Roma Sotterranea," page 73, particularly as this figure is of the greatest importance in Christian symbolism, which some might be inclined to think was more imaginary than real, and, perhaps, even quite fanciful and arbitrary. Speaking of a recently-discovered painting in an ancient Christian cemetery, at Alexandria, in which is represented, precisely over the altar where the holy mysteries were celebrated, a banquet of our Lord and Apostles, in which figures a plate with two fishes and several baskets of bread; and, at a little distance, the miracle of Cana; and again, in another compartment, a number of persons seated at a feast, with this legend over their heads, "Eating the benedictions of Christ"; the whole undoubtedly representing the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—the Holy Eucharist,—they say that the Christian artist "Has furnished us with a most precious monument, proving the identity, not only of Christian doctrine, but even of Christian artistic symbolism, both in the East and the West. We have shown the same truth elsewhere, by an appeal to epitaphs; we have shown that the same doctrines were expressed by the same forms in Rome and Alexandria, in France, in Egypt, and in Phrygia. Every baptized Christian understood them, whether he lived on the banks of the Tiber or of the Po, of the Loire, the Euphrates, or the Nile. In all these parts of the world, writers in books, poets in hymns, preachers in sermons, artists in painting, the very masons themselves on the tombstones made use of the fish in this symbolical sense, without a word of explanation. It is evident that, however unmeaning the figure

may have been to pagan eyes, or however strange it may seem to our own who are no longer familiar with it, it was as perfectly intelligible to contemporary Christians as the hieroglyphics of ancient Egypt to those who used them, or the letters of the English alphabet to Englishmen."

The Dolphin, which is noted for its velocity, and this world being often likened to a sea, was an early symbol of the intense desire and indefatigable advance of the Christian towards another and better world. It figures, in large dimensions, on sepulchral slabs and tombs, and more minutely on finger-rings and slighter ornaments, when it is usually represented twined about an anchor. The anchor being a symbol of hope, and the Christian's only hope being in the Cross of Christ, and being, also, a disguised form of the Cross, this constant union of dolphin and anchor on small articles worn about the person seems like a symbolical rendering of this verse of the Psalmist, "It is good for me to *adhere* to my God, to put my *hope* in the Lord God."

Trees of different species have been frequently found represented on ancient Christian monuments. The great archæologists, Aringhi, Lupi, Boldetti, Buonarotti and others, struck by the frequent repetition of this symbol, have studied its signification with much care. The tree, then, is first a symbol of Jesus Christ, who is the Tree of Life. In this sense Origen takes it in his commentary on this passage of St. Paul to the Romans: "If we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, in like manner we shall be of His resurrection." Secondly, the tree is a symbol of man. In this sense it is taken by St. Jerome and Fulgentius, because his works are either good or bad, as the tree bears either good or bad fruit; and the former particularly founds himself on the figurative speech of our Lord in the seventh chapter of St. Matthew. Thirdly, trees decked in their foliage are a symbol of Paradise, the beauty of which is ever green and refreshes the saints. In this sense they figure in many mosaics and on many sculptured stones, and even in the diminutive glass cups or vases. The intercessory power of the Saints now reigning with Christ in glory, is shown in connection with this symbol in a very ancient picture of the virgin martyr Agnes, standing amidst umbrageous trees in the attitude of prayer. In this connection of trees in foliage representing symbolically the place of peace and repose, it is nearly thirty years ago, that, while studying at Rome this particular branch of early Christian Antiquities, we were touched by the exquisite appropriateness of those last delirious words of a famous God-fearing general: "Let us cross over the river and rest in the shade of the trees."¹ On tombs and sepulchral slabs we

¹ Stonewall Jackson.

sometimes remark a singular juxtaposition of trees, two being represented, one bare and the other covered with leaves. It has been interpreted to signify man's nakedness of good works—supernatural works—before baptism, and of his being clothed with righteousness after baptism. This seems to be the correct meaning, because two such trees figure one on either side of a neophyte who is receiving this sacrament. It may also be, as has been suggested, that these two trees thus opposed to each other were meant to symbolize the emptiness and vanity of this life and the fullness and joy of the life to come. The tree on sepulchres is often—especially when the kind represented is deciduous—a symbol of the change, the resurrection, the new life. The palm was used even by the heathens as an emblem of victory, and was adopted in the same general sense into the body of Christian symbolism. On tombs and sepulchral slabs the palm is generally accompanied by the monogram of Christ, to show that no self-conquest is possible except by virtue of the cross. The palm is next a general symbol of martyrdom. It does not, however, of itself alone present indubitable proof, when found on a sepulchral slab or tomb, that the deceased was a martyr; but taken cumulatively with representations of some instrument of torture, or on tombs in which the remains of linens once dipped in blood are found, or to which, imbedded in the now hardened mortar, phials which have contained blood have been attached, the palm is a most sure indication of martyrdom. The Scriptures contain, in many places, allegorical passages in which the vine figures, but leaving these and the writings of the Fathers, in which sometimes Christ and His Church, that covers the whole earth as this plant puts out its branches in every direction, is likened to the vine; it is remarkable, how often the vine, with its tendrils and its fruit, is represented in the mural paintings and on the bas-reliefs of the catacombs. Over and above any mere decorative design, we must see in this frequent repetition a determined purpose to keep before the minds of the faithful, in their confined and subterranean chambers, to which they were driven by unjust persecution, thoughts of a happy future, thoughts of Heaven. This view of a symbolical intention is confirmed by seeing little birds, and especially doves,—figures of souls released from the body—flying about amidst the trellis work, resting on vine branches, and pecking at clusters of grapes. Very often a single bunch of grapes is carefully represented on sepulchral slabs and on gilded glass used in eucharistic feasts. Now it is well known that the same symbol was used by the Jews of old to betoken the Promised Land, and there is no doubt that the early Christians, many of whom in Rome itself were converts from Judaism, retained the same symbol, but trans-

lated it from its more immediate and temporal sense to the remoter and eternal one, for, as St. Paul says, all these things happened to the Jews in figure. The Church having always used the word *Paradise*, which means, in Greek, a garden, to designate the abode of the just, Christian artists were naturally induced to decorate with flowers of various sorts the tombs of martyrs and the chambers of the catacombs in which those mysteries were dispensed which prepare man for Heaven.

Very often shells and conchs have been discovered in early tombs or stuck on the outside into the mortar while still soft, just before closing, or are seen engraved upon the slab. The frequent repetition in different parts of the Christian world of the same thing, clearly points to a fixed purpose, and to one not affecting a local belief, hope or scene, but to some general belief. This is no other than the dogma of the Resurrection; the idea being that, of the living soul breaking through death from its narrow prison of the body—the shell of mortality—which yet retains a pledge of immortality in the Holy Viaticum, by which it is not left altogether without, at least, some semblance of a continued mysterious existence even in the tomb, as the shell whence the living mollusk has departed still gives forth, when held to the ear, a sweet, soul-stirring music, awakening keen emotions and strange yearnings after we know not what, and distant impressions from we know not whence. It has been observed that the species of shell almost always used by the Gauls was the *Helix pomatia* of our conchologists, which, when it retires within its cover at the approach of winter, has the faculty of closing the entrance by a peculiar kind of thin but impenetrable membrane called the epiphragm, which it bursts open to issue forth at the approach of spring. This hibernation was aptly chosen to symbolize the silence of the tomb, which will be broken when the dead shall rise again at the last day.

The sun and moon have been represented on early Christian monuments in connection with our Lord as the Eternal Pastor, these celestial figures having been used by the pagans for symbols of eternity. They are also often, but at a comparatively late period, seen in representations of the Crucifixion, because these heavenly luminaries suffered eclipse and mourned with the Author of Nature when He died. The Star is frequently used on ancient Christian monuments. In the first order of ideas it is a symbol of the divinity of Jesus Christ and of His supreme dominion over all things in heaven and on earth, hence our Lord is sometimes represented between two or more stars. In another order of ideas stars are a symbol of His Church, and then they are always just seven in number. When, therefore, this particular number is found upon Christian tombs, erected, as may be conjectured, during a period of

schism or at the prevalence of some heresy, it indubitably stands for a silent protestation that the deceased sleeps in the peace of the one true Church.

On a small number of Christian monuments the signs of the Zodiac are represented. Boldetti has delineated a beautiful ancient bracelet, on the inside and outside circles of which the twelve Signs are engraved. It has been plausibly conjectured that far from serving a superstitious use, in the manner of the heathens, who were given up to astrology, it was piously worn as a constant reminder of the instability of human events and the mutabilities of fortune, and that *we* go away but *they* remain; nor can we doubt that the words of Ecclesiastes were familiar to the wearer: "A generation passeth away and a generation cometh, but the earth standeth forever."

The four seasons have been symbolically represented along with the figure of the Good Shepherd. It is in this connection an emblem of Providence, which provides our daily food and leads us, the sheep, to proper pastures.

Marble eggs and sometimes the shells of real eggs, therein deposited before closing, have been found in early Christian tombs. They were symbols of the Resurrection.

A hand issuing out of a cloud was always a symbol of the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, God the Father, because the hand is naturally an emblem of work, and the making of all things out of nothing, the creative act, is theologically ascribed to the Father.

However paradoxical it may appear, we can assert that in this age almost the only survivor of the early and mediæval symbolism of the church, is found in that decried but little understood science of heraldry which was essentially religious in its origin and was entirely suggested by the clergy, who in those times when it arose, were alone competent to interpret and to parcel out to deserving individuals the perishing fragments of such a system. (See Lord Lindsay's "Sketches of Christian Art," II., 49.)

ROBERT SETON.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

NO. 3. THE ACCOMPLISHMENT.

THE memorable morrow came, August 3d, 1492, which was destined to witness a sight quite ordinary in general appearance, yet in motive, aim, and results, unprecedented in history: a morrow, such as old Chaucer sang of in quaintest phrase:

But by the cause that they shulden rise
Early *a-morwe* for to seen the sight.

It was a Friday, a day made famous by the triumphs of Columbus, for it was on that day, also, that he discovered America. It was therefore most appropriate, what this Christian hero then announced, as Oviedo the historian informs us, that he sailed in the name of Jesus Christ. He fervently recalled the day of Christ's redemption of man. The hero of a new crusade, he remembered that on that day Godfrey de Bouillon, his precursor, delivered the Holy Sepulchre from the power of the Mahomedan, and on that day, a campaign in Spain, in which he had served himself as a crusader, Mahomedanism was conquered and driven from Europe. While the stars were yet shining, and half-way between midnight and dawn, at the convent of La Rabida, the prior of the convent offered the Holy Mass for a new intention, and the Admiral of the Ocean received the Holy Eucharist; might it not be his Viaticum?

The monk and the mariner descend the convent steps together; the port of Palos is soon reached; the watch guards had seen the lights of sacrifice shining through the convent windows and now the signals are given from the three caravels; the admiral receives the last blessing of the monk on the shore. He now stands on the deck of his flag-ship beneath the royal pennant; the inhabitants of Palos throng the shore; the sails receive the grateful breeze; the word of command is given, and Columbus, waving adieu to country, sons, friends and all the people on shore, announces that he sails in the name of his Saviour. No vessel had ever sailed due west through and across the Sea of Darkness before—but the prows are turned to the west—the Sea of Darkness lies before them,—the people exclaimed they can never return—such were the feelings of the people; the people of Palos, the fathers and mothers, the sisters and brothers, the friends and sweethearts, of the

doomed crew on the three caravels; such too was the feeling among the sailors of the crews—farewell to Spain forever!

“It were vain to speak, to weep, to sigh;
Oh! more than tears of blood can tell,
* * * * *
Are in the word, farewell—farewell.”

Sadness on shore and on deck was further supplemented by the anger and disloyalty of Gomez Rascon and Cristobal Quintero, the owners of the *Pinta*, which had been impressed, and who were sulking on the ship and amid the crew.

But there was one man on board, who stood on the deck of the flag-ship, full of courage, hope, faith, determination and firm resolve. He waved farewell to the monk of Rabida, to the people of Palos, and to Spain, with manly good will and loyalty, and then turned his face and his heart to the west. He entered on the opening page of his historic journal, that he commenced the voyage:

IN NOMINE DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI.

With appalling difficulties, trials, dangers and disloyalties immediately before him, Columbus was even now virtually the Discoverer of the New World.

The *Santa Maria* was a single-decked craft, ninety feet long, with twenty feet breadth of beam. Neither the *Pinta* nor the *Niña* were decked amidships. The whole expedition contained only ninety persons. The ships were such as might be employed on a yachting cruise up the East River and Long Island Sound. Columbus sailed a half hour before sunrise; south lay the course for forty-five geographic miles and then shifting a couple of points to starboard the little fleet stood for the Canaries, in order that they might thence sail due west on the 28th parallel, expecting thus to reach the northern end of Cipango, and thence to Zaiton (Chang-Chow) and other cities of China so graphically described by Marco Polo. Troubles now began to commingle with the Admiral's brightest hopes. The rudder of the *Pinta* became broken and unshipped, and the circumstances indicated that it was the foul work of her owners and crew. But immediately he saw the hand of Providence in the proximity of the Canaries, and here he stopped for repairs, the islands being then most appropriately known as the Fortunate Islands. Now again consternation was spread among the sailors by an eruption of Teneriffe in full view; and again by the rumors of Portuguese ships hovering near to capture Columbus and his fleet. Having again set sail, now due westward, on September 6th, on the 8th the last land of the eastern hemisphere, the shores

of Ferro, disappeared from sight, and the ships were plunging into the Dark Ocean, while many of the sailors violently lamented their fate and cried like children. In order to avoid threatened mutiny, the Admiral kept two reckonings of the distance run, a correct one for himself, a shorter one for the frightened crews. Columbus saw only, and blessed, the hand of Providence in the propitious weather. On September 13th, he observed and was startled by the deflection of the needle, thus creating new alarms, which his ready resources allayed, while he treasured the observations for the cause of science. Winsor, who could see nothing good in Columbus, or even in Isabella, admitted that this discovery marks a point in the history of navigation. On the 16th, he discovered the great oceanic region of sea weeds, Sargasso Sea, a vast extent of green resembling a boundless pasture six times larger than France. This discovery was important as it disclosed and located the regions provided by Providence for the generation and growth of sea-food. Fears of direful evil increased among the crews—all seemed weird and uncanny. If the ships escaped fatal entanglements, they would be foundered on hidden rocks, or swallowed by monsters. Soundings, however, did not reach bottom, for the water was over 2000 fathoms deep. On September 22d, the ships were again in the open sea, free from grass and weeds, but the winds all blew to the west (the Trade Winds), and the sailors were panic-struck at the thought of never having a contrary or west wind to carry them home again to Spain. The Admiral again blessed Providence for a change of the wind to the southwest, showing their capability for change and convincing the crews that the winds might yet carry them homeward. The crews next became impatient for land; he found it taxed all his immense resources to restrain them. On September 25th, a mirage disclosed to their deluded visions phantom hills (in Cipango) but the consequent joyous hymns of thanks soon died upon the waves, to be succeeded by mutterings of disappointment and sedition. The flight of birds now gave hopes, but these also sped away together in the sightless distance. Alternate hopes and fears, imaginations and disappointments, succeeded each other with every alternate sign of land. Surely the doomed ships and fated crews were immersed and plunging deeper in space, delusion, enchantment, deception and death. The mutiny of the crews rankled in the hearts of the sailors, and increased until the murder of the Admiral was even canvassed—the sea he had so eagerly sought would as eagerly receive and devour him, and it too would obliterate every trace of the guilt of the mutineers and murderers; how easy it would be to say “he had fallen overboard while gazing at the stars.” So far a superstitious faith in his superior knowledge had saved him.

When October 4th came, the admiral was in momentary fear of an outbreak—he alone knew of all on board the distance they had travelled from home; and on that very day he reported the reckoning of the day 138 miles when the true distance was 189. On the 7th the ships had traversed in all 2724 miles; the Admiral reported 2200; he had actually travelled 224 miles further than he had estimated the distance to Cipango. His pilots urged him to change his course to the southwest; they thought he had passed between and beyond the islands—he began to fear himself that he was sailing past Cipango. If flights of birds among ancient Greeks and Romans, determined, as sacred omens, the gravest affairs of State, of peace and war, so now the frequent appearance and flight of small birds, such as inhabit the shores, to the southwest, confirmed the impressions that land lay in that direction. Yielding to these signs and to the importunity of his pilots, he changed his course to the southwest. Was this change fortunate or unfortunate? Fortunate in this, that by the change he had only 505 miles to reach the goal, whereas by keeping on due west he had 720 miles, and an open revolt, and his own death may thus have been prevented. But unfortunate in this, that by the latter or west course he would have struck the coast of Florida, a little south of Cape Malabar, and the Continent at once would have been his; he would have founded an empire and erected a civilization within the limits of our own Republic. What might not have been the results of such a course upon our own destiny!

It has been generally believed, no doubt upon the unreliable authority of Oviedo, that Columbus, about this time, capitulated with his crews, and promised to turn his prow to the east and return to Spain, if land were not discovered in three days. This report is discredited and is now rejected by historians. Yet his conviction that land was near amounted to absolute faith. On the other hand the wildest excitement prevailed on board. Columbus with sublime composure observed every phenomenon of the heavens and the seas; every situation of the stars, every swell and sign of the waters. A new world of nature, and of nature's ways and products was faithfully and enthusiastically recorded in his journal. The signs of land at hand increased every moment. On October 11th, these signs became unmistakable. Mutiny was hushed in instant expectation and watching. In the middle of this frantic excitement, the thought of self and self possessed the minds of all, and all eyes were eagerly strained, each one hoping to win the reward of 10,000 maravedis promised to the one that first should see the land. The vigils and watches of the admiral had not ceased by day or by night. How could human nature hold out under such strain? How could he fail to be the first to see the land which he himself had promised?

On the sunset of the eleventh of October there was a slight reaction at the delay of the land in coming into view, and many false alarms and excitements had occurred. Washington Irving says that "Columbus considered himself under the immediate eye and guardianship of Heaven in this solemn enterprise." His vigils were incessant, interrupted not by sleep or rest, but only at regular intervals when he retired to recite the pious office of the Franciscans. Day and night he was at the poop, watching the helm, scanning the sea, the air, the stars, and mounting frequently to the top-mast. He noticed what seemed to him extraordinary changes in the face of nature. He scanned the horizon, tested with the keenest sense of smell the saline effluvia of the ocean to detect the possible odors of land, of vegetation, and of human or animal life. The winds were studied, the water tasted, the temperature of air and water observed, soundings of the water-depths were taken. Experiments were made on the forces and directions of the ocean's currents; he seized and examined every passing herb or blade of grass; a little lobster caught from the waves was minutely studied, for they never ventured far from coast, and from a school of tunnies one was harpooned and carefully examined on deck. Martin Alonzo Pinzon had called out from his ship, the Pinta, "Land! Land! Señor, I am the first who saw it; declare my right to the pension," and the *Gloria in Excelsis* had more than once been chanted at the sight of a phantom shore. In the midst of the hourly excitement, Columbus was calm, intent on studying the physical phenomena of the new regions, while never for a moment relaxing his vigils at poop and helm. "The sea is always fine," he exclaimed, "be infinite thanks rendered to God." Martin Alonzo Pinzon heretofore trustful in the genius and knowledge of Columbus had now failed in courage; he and his brothers joined in the revolt of the crews. The signs of land at the close of October 11th, had rekindled the hopes of all; the setting sun, however, had not revealed the land; surely it would be discovered before another sun went down.

When night had set in Columbus took his vigil as usual at the tower-like poop of the Santa Maria; his eyes were straining with more than wonted eagerness. When suddenly at 10 o'clock, he beheld a distant light apparently on the shore; it moved about, and up and down, as if carried in the hand of a human being running along the shore. He called a royal officer, named Pedro Gutierrez, who also saw it; others were called to see the joyous yet doubtful sight; the light disappeared and again returned to sight. While others doubted or denied, Columbus declared his belief that they had reached the land, and that it was inhabited. At midnight all was still, but the Admiral's assertion had electrified

all ; the ships were kept near together, carried little sail, but the wind carried the fleet rapidly westward ; the *Pinta* got far ahead of the other ships. Not an eye was closed on the three ships. Two hours more had passed in eager and unbearable suspense, and the watches cried two o'clock of October 12th, when suddenly like a bolt from Heaven, the sound of a gun on board the foremost ship, the *Pinta*, announced to all the sight of land. It had been seen first by a sailor named Rodrigo de Triana (Count de Lorgues gives his name as Juan Rodriguez Bermego.) Land was seen in the very direction in which Columbus had seen the light on shore. A shout of joy went from all ; the sails were quickly lowered, the ships lay to, and the time before day was busily occupied by all on board the three ships in burnishing their arms and putting on their best attire. Columbus, with his usual prudence, put the flotilla in a state of defence. Who knew but that the fleets and armies of some great Asiatic potentate might be marshalled on hostile shores to annihilate them in the morning ? The entire crew of the flagship, so lately open mutineers, now came forward in a body to do homage to the Admiral. The latter threw himself upon his knees and intoned the *TE DEUM LAUDAMUS*, and the whole of the crews joyously responded to the pæan.

On Friday, October 12, 1492, Columbus accompanied by the captains and officers, and some sailors, landed on the shores of an island, a part of the New World, and took possession in the name of the Saviour, and of Spain for Ferdinand and Isabella. The natives called the island Guanahani, Columbus named it San Salvador. Being the first to land, he fell upon his knees and kissed the earth three times. Columbus broke the choking and impressive silence of this momentous occasion with the following prayer, which, by order of the Spanish sovereigns was used by Cortez, Balboa, Pizarro, and other discoverers ; " Lord ! Eternal and Almighty God ! who, by Thy sacred word, hast created the heavens, the earth, and the seas, may Thy name be blessed and glorified everywhere. May Thy Majesty be exalted, who hast deigned to permit that by thy humble servant, Thy sacred name should be made known and preached in this other part of the world."

Several islands claim the honor of having been the Indian Guanahani, the Spanish San Salvador, and amongst these are chiefly Cat Island, Samana or Atwood's Bay, and Watling's Island. The natives were perfectly naked ; they were frightened beyond expression at this apparition, and fled to the woods. When, gradually drawn by the smiles and kindness of the Spaniards, they timidly approached, with awe and wonder, felt the beard, the persons and the weapons of the dread strangers, to see if they were real ; they believed that they had descended from the skies.

When the Admiral cruised about, he found and visited four islands, and concluded that he was in the region of the ocean just east of Cathay. Upon learning that gold was to be found to the south, he sailed thither on October 25th, expecting to find Cipango, and thence to sail along the coast of China to Quinsay, and to deliver to the Grand Kahn the credentials he had received from Ferdinand and Isabella. He reached Cuba, supposing it to be a part of the Asiatic Continent, and sent a deputation to find a prince said to be at war with the Grand Kahn, hoping thus to gain tidings and visit the latter potentate. Neither Oriental potentates, nor cities, nor palaces, nor spices, nor gold was found; but something they did find, which was destined to affect the lives and fortunes, and health and happiness of the world's millions for all time, and to produce revenues greater than that of all the spices, gold, and treasures of the east—*Tobacco*. Disappointed and bewildered, he turned his prow to the southeast in quest of another great island abounding in gold. And now Martin Alonzo Pinzon deserted his post, and his chief—he hoped no doubt, to visit rich islands first with his fleet ship and return to Spain, before the Admiral, and claim the discovery.

Having sailed eastward to the end of Cuba, Columbus supposed it was the end of Asia, and then he discovered Hayti, where he landed and called it Hispaniola. Here again he searched for the rich region of Cipango, which still eluded his search. On Christmas day the flagship, the Santa Maria, was wrecked, and all was transferred, crew, armament, and provisions to the Niña, now his only ship. Alas! he thought, should this little vessel go under, the world would not know that Columbus had discovered a world, and Martin Alonzo Pinzon, the deserter, would claim the honor and fruits of the discovery. This thought brought him at once to the decision of returning to Spain. He had found a devoted friend in Guacanagari, a native chief of that part of Hayti, where he landed. A fort was constructed of the wrecked ship's timbers, armed with her guns, and called *La Navidad*, in honor of the Christmas festival. Such was the beauty of the island, its fruits and climate, such the friendship of the neighboring cacique, such the indolence, the comfort and self-indulgence which had followed the speedy alliances formed by the Spaniards with the Indians, that many begged to be chosen among the garrison, which the Admiral would leave at La Navidad, while he returned to Spain. It seemed but a necessity, an obvious policy, that Columbus should found in the New World a colony, to continue the immediate possession, the evidences of the discovery, and form a living link between Spain and Hispaniola, between the Old and the New Worlds. With such a fort, armament, and garrison, with

Spanish superiority over native savages, and with the friendship of Guacanagari and his subjects, the forty men left behind under the command of Diego Arana, were perfectly safe against every possible hostile act of the natives. But would they be safe against their own vices and crimes?

On Friday, January 4, 1493, Columbus sailed in the *Niña* on his return voyage to Spain, having admonished the garrison of La Navidad in terms well calculated to be remembered by them and faithfully observed for their own safety. Columbus sailed along the northern coast of Hispaniola, and after two days he encountered Pinzon, the deserter, on the *Pinta*, who endeavored to excuse his treachery by pretexts based on his being delayed in trading with the natives, by his search for gold and being separated by storms. Columbus prudently concealed his indignation, and the *Pinta* and *Niña* sailed homeward in concert. He compelled Pinzon to restore to liberty five Indian men and two girls whom he had seized and was carrying to Spain to make them slaves. On January 10th occurred the first hostile encounter between the Indians and the Spaniards. The voyage was replete with hardships, dangers, escapes of every kind. A barrel, containing an account of his discovery, sealed up in a jar, was cast overboard, and another kept on deck, so as to announce by chance the result in case of shipwreck. The vessels were again separated, Columbus was finally driven ashore by a storm in Portugal, was received with honors at that treacherous court, and finally arrived at Palos on March 15th. Later on the same day the *Pinta* with Pinzon on board entered the same port; the false captain had endeavored to claim the discovery and had sent messengers to court; but when he found Columbus had arrived just a few hours before him, and the court spurned his treacherous approaches, he slinked ashore, hid himself and not long afterwards died from chagrin and mortification. Columbus was received at court in the city of Barcelona with such honors from the king, queen, nobility and people as never before or since have greeted hero, conqueror or discoverer. The interest felt in the specimens he brought from the new world was intense, for he exhibited in his triumphal progress and at court stuffed birds and animals, live parrots, some pearls, gold and other minerals, plants and various articles, but above all six Indians, survivors of the ten he sailed with, natives of the West, all painted and dressed in their native style. It is impossible to describe the scenes, the honors, the impressions, the rejoicings, the results of this unparalleled event. All historians concur in the testimony that Columbus bore himself amid these dazzling events and scenes with such dignity, modesty, intelligence and manliness as to win universal admiration. In addition to unprecedented

honors at court, Columbus received the most distinguished honors and fêtes from the nobility. I might here relate the story of his making the egg stand on end, but I can only refer to it to discard the story; though of no importance it still has no historic support.

It was easy for him now to obtain from the crown another fleet, and from the people ample volunteers for a second voyage. Numerous applications had to be rejected. The details of his four voyages have to be condensed in a single article. All who embarked felt sure they were sailing for the most opulent parts of Asia, and that unbounded wealth awaited them. All ranks of society now sought to embark, from the common sailor to the most noted and distinguished members of the nobility and chieftains distinguished in the Moorish war. Among the many eminent names I will mention only the already celebrated prior of the convent of La Rabida, Juan Perez de Marchena, Juan Ponce de Leon, afterwards famous as the discoverer of Florida, and the father and uncle of the good and great Las Casas, who afterward became the apostle and the liberator of the Indians. The expedition sailed from Cadiz on September 25, 1493, and amongst the many eager and enthusiastic persons of all grades and conditions, who witnessed the grand and notable event, were the two sons of Columbus, Diego and Fernando, the younger being then only five years of age. The expedition consisted of fourteen caravels and three larger store-ships called carracks, and they carried out many things never seen before in America, horses, mules, cattle, European cereals, vines, sugar cane, and indeed everything needed for a permanent colony. The crown had established a Bureau of the Indies, and over it was placed, in accordance with the then prevailing custom of that age and country, an ecclesiastic, who by accepting such an appointment must have utterly abandoned all care of souls and all zeal for religion. This was Juan Rodriguez de Fonseca, then archdeacon of Seville; for thirty years he exercised with immense power the direction of the affairs of the Spanish new world, and was noted for his executive ability and his untiring energy in the secular, pecuniary and commissary affairs confided to him. For his services in such worldly pursuits he received from the crown the bishoprics of Badajoz, Cordova, Palencia and Condè, and the archbishopric of Rosano in Italy together with the bishopric of Burgos. In the midst of his worldly and business functions it must be doubtful whether he had time ever to enter the territories of some of his dioceses. He was also principal chaplain to Ferdinand, and afterwards to Isabella. With so many offices his emoluments must have been immense. Columbus, and subsequent discoverers, suffered under his animosity, and Fonseca's concentrated hatred was equal to that of as many officials as he

himself bore titles and offices. Columbus soon fell under his dislike, and suffered untold wrongs and injustices at his hands.

There was made provision now also for the spiritual needs of the natives and of the Spaniards, for the lessons of history that followed teach that the latter greatly needed such forethought of the Holy See and of the crown. An ecclesiastical and missionary organization was formed, a Vicariate Apostolic of the Indies, and Father Boil, a native of Catalonia and a Benedictine monk of Montserrat, was appointed superior of the mission, or Vicar-Apostolic, and the mission embraced several religious co-laborers. Father Boil was a favorite of Ferdinand, and long attendance on court had interested him in secular and diplomatic concerns. Such was the compact organization of Europe and of the Church in Europe, such the isolation of pagan lands, that the missionary spirit had not as yet been developed among the clergy of the fifteenth century as was so splendidly exhibited afterwards in the sixteenth century with St. Francis Xavier and his brethren, and subsequently when Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans and other Religious Orders sought to evangelize the Indians in North and South America. Father Boil was not a volunteer. But when appointed he obeyed the call. Such was his feeling of fairness and admiration for the Admiral at this time that when Soria, the Comptroller-General of the Indians, and a follower of Fonseca, with the connivance of the latter, heaped outrages upon Columbus, Father Boil wrote to Queen Isabella and had his wrongs redressed. These details, the hostile Fonseca, and Soria in Spain, Vicar-Apostolic Boil in Hispaniola, who did not seek his mission but accepted the office offered him, and a colony greatly composed of a proud and punctilious nobility, show in advance the difficult task assigned to the Admiral in the administration of Hispaniola. Add to this the peculiar circumstances of the Indians, the greater part in numbers, yet the weakest and most untried part of his vice-regal subjects. Yet under such unprecedented circumstances Mr. Irving recognizes in his administration the most consummate wisdom and action. The members of the expedition were limited to 1200, but such was the eagerness to embark that the actual number embarked was 1500, and great numbers were turned away. Diego Columbus, the admiral's youngest brother, came from Genoa, on the announcement of his great discovery in 1492, and joined the second expedition. On October 7th the fleet weighed anchor for the Canaries; the course was west and slightly south.

On November 3d the islands of the New World were again sighted, and calling the first island Dominica, in honor of the Lord's Day, Columbus cruised among the Caribbean or Cannibal Islands; such was the ferocity of their inhabitants, that their very name of Can-

nibal has now become the name of man-eaters generally. Arriving at La Navidad on November 27th, the Admiral, to his consternation and grief, found the fortress demolished and the garrison murdered. It was a still greater grief to learn on investigation that it was the passions, the lusts, disobedience to superiors, and general misconduct of most of the men, that led to this catastrophe. The Indians found the white men not celestial, but excessively human. The principal events of this second expedition were the founding of the city of Isabella, afterwards superseded by that of San Domingo, the exploration of Cibao, which was found not to be the golden Cipango of Marco Polo, the exploration of the coast of Cuba, the discovery of Jamaica, and the erroneous impressions that they were on the Asiatic coast was as erroneously, yet unanimously confirmed, in the minds of all. The long and excessive fatigues of the Admiral, both of mind and body, threw him into a profound lethargy, and on his coming out of it he found his faithful brother Bartholomew, just arrived from Spain, at his side. Bartholomew Columbus had been sent by his brother from Spain to England in order to obtain the acceptance of his proposals from Henry VII., and from this Catholic king he had actually received favorable promises, and on his return through Paris, he there heard of his brother's great discovery, and received from the French king assistance on his homeward journey and tokens of distinguished regard. Columbus, who was still suffering from his late illness, welcomed his brother with joy, and appointed him Adelantado, or governor, and also clothed him with full power during his own convalescence.

Before going on his exploration, Columbus sent back to Spain Antonio de Torres, with twelve ships. The most important feature of this return voyage was the letter which Columbus addressed to the Spanish sovereigns, in which he set forth his views in relation to the future administration of the Vice-Regal Government of Hispaniola, the wisdom of which suggestions subsequent events proved—a proof, however, chiefly drawn from the disregard of the Admiral's recommendations. His suggestion that the Caribs, who constantly waged war on their inoffensive neighbors and reduced them to slavery, murdering the men and seizing their women for wives, and even making a practice of eating many of their human prisoners, should be sent to Spain and sold for slaves at the discretion of the sovereigns, was the only recommendation of the Admiral which they, after great deliberation and consultation, declined to approve. This subject will be considered in our last article on Columbus. But the approval of his suggestions generally did not ensure the means necessary to enable Columbus to carry them into effect.

The building of the new city of Isabella became the engrossing effort, and, in spite of the unhealthiness of the climate, the unwillingness of cavaliers to labor, and the machinations of the disaffected Spaniards, the Admiral saw presently built a neat little Spanish town, with church, market-place, public granary, dwelling-house, and a stone wall enclosing all. Having explored the interior of the island in person, and finished the exploration of the adjacent islands, he found on his recovery from his prolonged lethargy that many of the men whom he had trusted with the administration during his absence, proved unfaithful. Margarite, a royal officer, had been left in command of the open country, Ojeda of the fort, and his brother Diego was appointed governor of the colony, together with a council consisting of Father Boil and three leading men, Diego being president of the council. The Spanish noblemen in Hispaniola would submit to no restraints, but rioted in the land, tyrannizing over and murdering the natives, abusing the women, and slaying each other in private feuds. The gentle Cacique, Guacanagari, the Spaniards' friend, even suffered from them. Father Boil insisted upon condemning him and subjecting him to severest treatment. Margarite, a favorite of King Ferdinand, became the leader of a band of insurgents, and Father Boil, incensed at the Admiral's protection of Guacanagari, joined the disaffected. He knew little of the policy of mercy and gentleness, even towards the ignorant Indians. A plot to seize the five remaining ships and return to Spain was discovered by Columbus in time to seize the rebel leader in this design, Bernal Diaz, and send him to Spain for trial. In the meantime the poor natives, whose confidence had been abused by the Spaniards throughout the island, whose provisions had been seized, appropriated, and even wantonly wasted, whose homes had been invaded and plundered, their dearest domestic rights invaded, their country overrun with lawlessness, and themselves subjected to every insult and outrage, revolted against the Spanish authority. The chieftain, Caonabo, became the leader of the other tribes, and all confederated to overwhelm and exterminate the hated strangers. Columbus and his two brothers, Bartholomew and Diego, who had had no part in the ill-treatment of the natives, had now to meet this Indian uprising from without, while discontented and lawless Spaniards sought their destruction within. Guacanagari, whom Father Boil had urged Columbus to condemn and punish for alleged disloyalty, hypocrisy and deceit, now proved faithful to the Admiral and to the Spanish to the end, while Margarite and Father Boil, in conspiracy with other malcontents, seized the ships and returned to Spain in the absence of the Admiral on his exploration. A bloody war ensued, many Spaniards were ambushed and slaughtered by

the Indians; but the firm measures of Columbus, aided by the stern military promptness and ability of his brother Bartholomew, led to the seizure and imprisonment of Caonabo and to the utter defeat of the Indians. It was thus that the Indians, towards whom Columbus had commenced the most pacific policy, until it was defeated by his own lawless Spanish subjects, were now the avowed enemies of the white men. As the Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, said, Columbus had been forced to become a conquerer in spite of himself. The confederation of the Indians, which had been broken by the seizure and imprisonment of Caonabo, the chief who had united all the other chiefs except Guacanagari against the Spaniards, was now continued by Anacaona, his principal wife; but the difficulty of keeping under subjection the white men, those who formed a very great part of his vice-regal government, was greater still, and while the Indians were subdued and had no mother country to appeal to, the mutinous Spaniards appealed to Spain, and sent thither every form of accusation and vilification against Columbus. In Spain these enemies found confederates in Bishop Fonseca, Margarite and Father Boil, the first of whom was a life-long enemy of Columbus, the second was a rebel against his own chief, in the face of the barbarians whom he also incited to revolt, and the last was a deserter of his flock, a missionary who abandoned his mission, a Vicar-Apostolic who preferred diplomacy to dogma, and the favor of a court to the spiritual vineyard of the Lord. These enemies accused Columbus of every crime their enmity could invent, exaggerated the confusion prevailing in Hispaniola, for which all three of them were in great part responsible, and even intimated that Columbus may have been lost at sea in his cruise to Cuba and Jamaica, for Margarite and Boil had sailed away in his absence. Of course the confidence of the Queen in the Admiral was shaken, and it was resolved to send out another to investigate the administration of Columbus, the condition of the island, and, if the Admiral were dead, to supersede him. Juan Aguado, a man whom, like the traitor Margarite, the Admiral had favored and recommended, was chosen by Fonseca, and in October, 1495, this official arrived at Isabella with four caravels laden with needed supplies; but he bore in his pocket a dubious and elastic commission, a source of unbounded mischief. It might well be suspected that Aguado had been secretly instructed by Fonseca, and that his commission had been framed with purposed vagueness. His arrival was hailed by the malcontents and culprits as the condemnation of Columbus and the justification of the rebels, for he soon joined the latter and intensified the confusion of the island, which he had been sent to allay. Offenders and criminals of every hue now started up and became accusers of the Admiral

and his brothers. Aguado showed himself an insolent upstart, puffed up by a little brief authority. He accused the Admiral, then absent from Isabella endeavoring to quell an Indian outbreak caused by Aguado's supporters, with purposely avoiding him, and he ignored the presence of Don Bartholomew and Don Diego, his brothers and representatives. Aguado was sending out a troop of horsemen to arrest the Admiral and bring him to his presence, while the Admiral, as soon as he received tidings of his arrival, hastened to the city to declare his utter submission to any orders his sovereigns might send. Aguado, exceeding his authority, made numerous arrests, and from the disloyal and guilty, willing witnesses and perjurers, he accumulated a huge mass of testimony against Columbus. The latter saw at once, with such an enemy returning and with Fonseca, Margarite and Boil already in Spain, it was necessary for him to go and defend himself at Court. It was a fortunate event for Columbus (for he had few of the favors of fortune now), that just at this moment were discovered rich gold mines on the Hayna and Ozema rivers. Columbus knew that gold would prove his most powerful defender at Court, certainly with the king. He thought, too, as Hispaniola had not turned out to be Cipango, it might now prove to be the Ophir of Solomon. So important was this discovery regarded that the Adelantado, Don Bartholomew, transferred the headquarters of the colony to that region in the summer of 1496, and thus were laid the foundations of the city of San Domingo.

The *Niña*, which meant the baby, was the only remaining ship, left from the storms and wrecks; another caravel was built for Aguado. Columbus on the *Niña* and Aguado on the new caravel, sailed for Spain. Unfortunately the ships were crowded with invalids and home-sick colonists, every one of whom was paraded as an evidence of the Admiral's misrule in Hispaniola. Such was the stormy voyage and such the delay, that provisions became scarce, and Columbus had great difficulty in saving the thirty Indians on board from being eaten by the very Spaniards who had accused him of unnecessary cruelty to the Indians and of sending the cannibal Caribs to Spain that they might be returned as Christian interpreters. They arrived in Spain on June 11, 1496. Caonabo, the brave Indian chieftain, died on the voyage in spite of the tender care of Columbus, of a broken heart.

The machinations of Fonseca, Boil, Margarite and Aguado were now seconded by the poor and miserable condition of the Spanish colonists returned on the ships. Columbus had discovered the new world, but he had never assumed the responsibility for the vices, excesses, sickness, or disappointments of all the adventurers that flocked thither. He now, as on all occa-

sions, acted with characteristic dignity. Remaining at Cadiz he sent a letter to the sovereigns announcing his arrival and his determination to await at Seville their orders. A month's delay seemed to him an unjust requital, to others a condemnation. During this month he wore publicly the brown habit and girdle of the Franciscans, thus signifying his disgust with the world and his inclination to retire to the shades of a spiritual and religious life. The narrow limits of cloister and cell were enough for the revealer of worlds. But there was something that overcame the machinations of his powerful enemies at court. Was it the gold of Hayna and Ozema? Was it not rather the good and generous heart and justice of Isabella?

While Columbus was waiting at the house of his good friend, the curate of Las Palacois, and wearing the garb of a Franciscan monk, he received at the end of a month a letter from the queen thanking him for his services to his country, to his sovereigns, and inviting him to visit them at court, then being held at Burgos, and here he was kindly received; no allusion was made to the complaints made against him, and he readily received promises of ships for a third expedition. The execution of this last promise was delayed by two royal marriages, the son and the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, to the daughter and the son of the Emperor Maximilian, and also by the depleted condition of the royal exchequer caused by the long wars of twenty years with the Moors, and now by the war with France. This delay was a lesser wrong to Columbus, whose life had been already consumed by delays, than the royal edicts of 1495, by which the Spanish sovereigns, in open violation of their engagements with Columbus, had granted to all native Spaniards the privilege of making, at their own risk and expense, voyages of discovery and traffic to the countries discovered by him. Columbus, who regarded his capitulations with the sovereigns as equivalent to an exclusive right, protested in vain against the unjust edict. The subsequent edict of May 10, 1497, which declared that it had not been the royal intention in any way to affect the rights of the Admiral, was a mere soother to his wronged feelings, for it did not prevent the sailing of an expedition only three weeks before, under the special auspices of King Ferdinand, with Vicente Yañez Pinzon as chief commander. Nor did it prevent other expeditions under the former edict. There was a still greater, and latent wrong, in this expedition of Pinzon, for in it sailed Americus Vesputius, who afterwards by error and misconception, but without any known design of his own, received the honor of bestowing his name on the new world. It is certainly one of the greatest wrongs to Columbus, one which now can never be undone, that the world which he discovered was named America instead of Columbia.

The delays which the Admiral now endured afford us an opportunity to mention the important and remarkable part taken by the Holy See in the affairs of the new world; an intervention which wonderfully exemplifies and exhibits the wisdom even in the temporal affairs of the world, which pointed out that sacred and Apostolic Power as the wisest and providential arbitrator of nations. We have already mentioned that Portugal had been for many years seeking the Indies by the southern route along the west coast of Africa, and had made considerable progress in this great undertaking under Prince Henry the Navigator and subsequent explorers, ending in the discovery of the (*East*) Indies in 1497 by Vasco de Gama. Columbus, in 1492, went in search of the same Asiatic regions by the western or Atlantic route, and he was the first to discover land. He discovered America five years before Gama reached Asia. He and all the world believed that he had found the Indies, and he called the new world he had discovered *The Indies*, and its inhabitants "Indians." Neither he nor his contemporaries ever knew that he had discovered the continents of a new hemisphere, or that the regions he had discovered were other than the Indies of Asia. Dutiful son of the Church he announced his great discoveries to the Holy See. The Indies, Indians, America, were all misnomers. But the continent was there, and Columbus had found it. The name signifieth but little.

Columbus had made his first proposals to Portugal. Spain had won the prize. There were royal heart-burnings in the two courts. While John II. of Portugal had not assented to the proposal of his courtiers to assassinate Columbus, he secretly sent out an expedition in 1481 to rob Columbus of the glory of his conception, and now after it had been accomplished he seriously entertained the thought of sending a small fleet across the Atlantic as soon as possible to take possession of a port, Cathay or Cipango, which Columbus had discovered, as a basis for disputing the claims of Spain. Pope Eugenius V. had expressly conceded "the Indies" to Portugal, and by the treaty of 1479 Spain had solemnly bound herself not to interfere with the discoveries and possessions of her rival. Portugal claimed the Indies. Long and tedious negotiations had taken place between the two rivals, tortuous and selfish in the extreme, and it was difficult to say where the diplomatic prestige lay, whether with wily Ferdinand or with astute John of Portugal. Ferdinand was universally regarded as the superior in heartless diplomacy, but John of Portugal in the end gained most by negotiation and treaty.

It became the province of the Holy See, the common centre of Christendom, to settle a dispute which menaced for ages to come the peace of Christendom. Ferdinand was quick in all matters of

worldly policy, and no sooner had Columbus reached Barcelona in triumph in 1493 than the wily King of Aragon sent an embassy to Rome to ask from Pope Alexander VI. a grant to Spain of "the Indies" discovered by Columbus. Columbus, in his Franciscan cell at La Rabida, and the prior of the convent had counselled together, and the *desideratum* of a line of demarkation between the two great maritime nations by which the new worlds were to be divided between them was solemnly discussed. Columbus urged the court of Spain to come to terms with Rome, and he urged the concession and adoption of a line dividing the east from the west, and granting to Portugal the world east of that line, and to Spain the world west of it. The able Jesuit Father, Arthur George Knight, thus describes the exalted position occupied by Columbus at this time, and after his return from his first voyage to the new world: "The Cross," he says, "had already be enplanted there, but that was only the beginning of the beginning. It was not enough to find a new world. Grave responsibilities devolved upon the finder. Columbus could now speak and be listened to. Kings and Popes would value his advice, perhaps shape their conduct upon it. The destinies of millions of immortal souls were delivered to his keeping." True to his mission, son of destiny and prophesy, as I have shown in the first two articles of this series, Columbus with true genius recommended the now famous and historical line of demarkation, and the Vicar of Christ was the arbiter to fix the crucial line Columbus proposed, and Pope Alexander VI., by Papal Bull of 4th May, 1493, decreed that a line should be drawn one hundred leagues to the west of the Azores and Cape de Verde Islands, and that Spain should be entitled to all the lands west and south of it, while Portugal had already received the concession of the rest of the undiscovered world to the east. Spain thus received an avowed reward for overthrowing Mohammedanism in the Iberian Peninsula, and now an apostolic mission was opened to her in what was supposed to be remotest India. On the following day, May 5th, the Pope issued a second Bull more fully defining the rights of Spain as distinguished from those of Portugal in the interests of perpetual peace. Count Roselly de Lorgues exultantly remarks that this line extended from pole to pole without passing through any of the lands of the earth, perhaps the only line that could be drawn on the earth passing entirely over the waters and not cutting in two any of the lands of the earth. It was the meridian 25° W. Mr. Fiske, in his learned work, "The Discovery of America," says that line of demarkation "was made in the spirit of even-handed justice," and, again, that "the equitable intent of the arrangement was manifest." Father Knight calls the line of demarkation "an inspiration," and Count de Lorgues calls it "a

miracle." The concession was made to Spain on condition of her propagating the Catholic faith in the new world.

The strenuous efforts of Portugal could not move the Pope to to vary the line. But John II. was dissatisfied, and he complained that he had not sea-room sufficient to prosecute his discoveries east and south. Those two wily monarchs, Ferdinand and John II., resorted again to diplomacy. Religion seemed ignored in their diplomacy. These negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Tordesillas, on June 7, 1494, whereby Spain, content with the vast empires she saw to the west, which she acquired by the discovery of Columbus, and in the interests of peace, no doubt supposing that she thus acquired all that was worth having, conceded to Portugal what she asked, and agreed to push the line back and westward three hundred and seventy leagues west of the Cape de Verde Islands, instead of the Papal line of one hundred leagues west. This concession gained for Portugal the vast empire of Brazil. The discovery of Brazil was accomplished by Pinzon and Americus Vesputius in 1497; the latter described it as *Novus Mundus*, a new world; he had no idea that it was embraced in the same continental discovery as that of Columbus; he described these new regions in good faith. It was afterwards that a young German professor of St. Diè, Waldseemuller, in the same ignorance, suggested that the *Novus Mundus* of Americus should be called in his honor America. Americus was friendly to Columbus and never aspired to this honor; it was, almost by inadvertence, that the name of America was bestowed upon the whole and upon both continents of the Western Hemisphere. It was unfortunate that Spain did not insist upon the Papal line of demarkation. It would have saved the empire of Brazil to Spain, would have gained for Columbus the honor of bestowing his name upon the New World, and this country would have been called Columbia. In this instance the wily Ferdinand was outwitted; Portugal got the better of Spain.

After two years of delay, worry, disappointments and distress, the second expedition of Columbus was now ready to sail. An infant colony planted in a distant and new world, which surely needed prompt and efficient sustenance and protection, had thus been left a prey to the most short-sighted neglect. This too at a crisis in its existence. It was two years lost also out of the career of a man who had shown his capacity to add vast empires to the Spanish rule, and boundless realms to Christendom. After enduring two years of petty annoyances and embarrassments from Fonseca and his minions in the Bureau of the Indies, a final and open insult was heaped upon the Admiral, just as he was about to embark on his ships, by a despicable underling of Fonseca, a converted

Hebrew, who felt that he could please his patron by insulting Columbus. The Admiral feeling that in the presence of his officers and crews, his dignity and prestige must be sustained, gave the insolent Jew a personal chastisement on the spot. However just was the punishment, its infliction then and there was an error of diplomacy. It was the only time that we have found that Columbus lost his temper. The circumstance was reported with every exaggeration by the chastised employee of Fonseca to his master, and the latter never forgave it. It is now admitted that he sought such pretexts, even trivial ones, for persecuting his victim. From that moment Fonseca persecuted Columbus with fiendish hatred. The good and venerable Bishop Las Casas attributes to this incident and the consequent increased hostility of Fonseca, the gradual and constant decline of the influence and fortunes of Columbus; for as Father Knight writes, it "was represented in dark colors (at court) when he was not present to defend himself." While the prospects of meeting a pacified and prosperous colony in Hispaniola did not await the Admiral, it was some relief to him to be at sea again, away from the machinations of his enemies, even though his crews, owing to the unwillingness of the people to enlist for the expedition, were composed of the lesser convicts from the prisons, whose imprisonment was commuted to a term of service in Hispaniola. Unfortunate as this policy was, it was cordially approved by the sovereigns when suggested by Columbus, and resulted in disaster to the colony. Some historians of late have cast the whole blame upon Columbus, without admitting the fact that every other course was adopted before resorting to this, but without success. Such was the desperate necessity of the colony and such the delay in getting ships and crews, that Columbus succeeded early in 1498 in sending out two caravels with relief, but he succeeded only after incredible personal labors, humiliations and suffering.

Finally Columbus commenced his third voyage on May 30, 1498, with six ships, carrying about two hundred men besides sailors. He sailed this time from San Lucar de Barrameda, in the name of the Holy Trinity, resolved to name the first land in Its honor, and having in view the discovery of the mainland or continent. The discovery of Trinidad and the Orinoco, of the continent off the coast of Paria, the pearl coast, were the momentous results of this voyage. With slight geographical data the genius of Columbus saw a continent. He arrived at San Domingo on August 30th, exhausted by his fatigues and watchings, and still more by the most painful and prostrating attacks of gout. Renewed wars with the Indians, the rebellion of the Spaniards under Roldan, rebels and Indians joining their forces against the authority of the Spanish government, even Spanish troops sent to resist the rebellion

treacherously joining the rebels, and a continuation of such disorders over a period of two years, were the principal remaining events of this third expedition. They exhausted the resources, broke the power, and endangered the position of Columbus and of his two brothers. The Admiral was compelled by sheer necessity to enter into terms with his enemies and the enemies of Spain, with Roldan and his rebel followers. All attempts to continue the great and momentous work of exploration and discovery were prostrated. Ill fortune deprived the Admiral of the opportunity of revealing the whole continent. The home government failed to sustain the Admiral in the very government with which he was entrusted, and Fonseca, charged with the business of sustaining Columbus, did all in his power to ruin him. Availing himself of the slanders and libels sent to Spain by the most degraded and unprincipled rebels against the government, Fonseca used them all at court to poison the minds of the sovereigns against Columbus. Reprobates returning from Hispaniola found a confederate in the official head of the Indian Bureau, and Fonseca sent them all to court to clamor at its gates for their pay, which they accused Columbus of withholding. Fifty of these scoundrels, at the instigation of the very official who should have arrested and punished them for their crimes and rebellions in Hispaniola, were gathered in one day in the very courtyard of the Alhambra, cursing the defamed and absent Admiral; catching hold of the king's robe as he passed out, and crying, "Pay us! Pay us!" And when the Admiral's young sons, Diego and Fernando Columbus, who were then pages in the queen's service, passed out of the palace, they were hooted at by this rabble of returned culprits from Hispaniola with cries, "There go the whelps of the Admiral of Mosquito-land, the man who has discovered a land of vanity and deceit, the grave of Spanish gentlemen!" All this was music of greatest melody to the embittered and hostile ears of Fonseca, the enemy of Columbus. The Jew whom the latter had chastised for a public act of insolence was dearer to Fonseca than the discoverer of the Indies. Such malice has never been surpassed in human history. Pains were taken to place before the eyes of the avaricious king the depleted condition of the royal treasury, the absence of profitable returns from the Indies, and the irremediable confusion of Hispaniola. The ear of Isabella was made to ring with calumny against the tyrannies of Columbus. Every charge was triumphantly refuted by him or by his historians. At this unpropitious time, however, in the summer of 1497, Vasco de Gama had reached Asia with the flag and ships of Portugal, by the southern African route, and returned in the summer of 1499; this event was adroitly and maliciously used by Fonseca and his minions against Colum-

bus. Nothing that malice and wickedness could suggest was left untried. The discovery of a new world, with its unseen and unknown continents, in a single voyage, was decried as inferior to the reaching of the known and accessible continent of Asia by a new route merely. Portugal was announced as having eclipsed the maritime achievements of Spain; Gama was a real hero, while Columbus was a mere adventurer. Execrations took the place of the pæans of glory which had greeted his triumphant return from the new world. It was not the least feature in the admiral's fall and continued and increasing unpopularity, that he was not a Spaniard, but a foreigner; he was, to use his own words, "absent, envied, and a foreigner in the land."

While Fonseca was struggling for his ruin in Spain, Columbus was struggling to save the Spanish power in the New World. To add to the desperation of his situation, the rebellion of Roldan was supplemented by the descent of Alonzo de Ojeda upon Hispaniola. Ojeda had been treacherously furnished by Fonseca with a chart of the Admiral's discoveries. He like Margarite, Roldan, Aguado, and others, had been raised to notice or power by himself. Such was the completeness of the Admiral's fall that he meditated flight from Hispaniola, together with his two brothers, who shared with him the hatred of his enemies. He was in momentary fear of assassination. In his agony he heard, or seemed to hear, a voice from Heaven, saying, "Oh! man of little faith, fear not, it is I." Taking courage from his vision and from the graces he received, he nerved himself to accept the chalice of woes that for two years had been at his lips. He reconciled to himself Roldan the rebel, and for want of other resources sent him with a force of men against the rebel or invader Ojeda. Then sprang up Moxica with a conspiracy to assassinate both Columbus and Roldan. The latter, under the skilful policy of Columbus, now rendered solid services in sustaining law and order, which lately he did so much to overthrow. Columbus triumphed over the leaders of his enemies in Hispaniola. Ojeda was expelled from the island, Moxica was captured and executed for his crimes at San Domingo. The elasticity of the Admiral's nature would have sustained him, but now in the midst of his efforts for his sovereigns, he received a letter from them, showing plainly that his truthful and honest defence had not prevailed over the machinations of Fonseca and his other enemies. The old adage, that falsehood travels a mile, while truth is putting on its boots, was realized in the case of Columbus. His fall was due entirely to the falsehoods of his enemies.

Columbus had already made great progress in the pacification of Hispaniola; he had sent a detailed and faithful account of the disturbances of the island to the sovereigns, and now at last there

seemed to dawn upon his eventful and painful life, a gleam of hope for a season of repose, and perhaps for realizing some portion of the revenues and rewards for the transcendent services he had rendered to his sovereigns, to Spain, and to the world. But all history has never afforded such an instance of disappointment, injustice and downfall. It was just at such a moment of nascent hope, that a fleet was seen entering unannounced the harbor, while Columbus was absent on public business at Fort Conception. No one could now imagine that the comments of this article and of historians universally, on the machinations of Fonseca, were severe, when the sequel comes out, as we are now about to relate.

The chief personage and commander of the fleet that thus so unceremoniously arrived at San Domingo, on August 23d, 1500, was none other than the notorious Francis Bobadilla, an instrument of Fonseca, whom that good hater had induced the Spanish sovereigns, by every sort of misrepresentation and intrigue, to appoint as a royal commissioner to go out to Hispaniola, to inquire into the state of the colony. This royal commissioner had a series of three letters or commissions, the first, second, and third; the second was not to be used in case the first sufficed, and the third was not to be used in case the first and second sufficed. In effect, he was to examine into the conduct of the Admiral, and in case he found him guilty, he was to supersede him. "Ferdinand," as Father Knight observes, "deserves the credit of this strange device, which promoted impartial judicial inquiry, by making it the immediate interest of the judge to condemn the accused." In fact, Columbus had been prejudged and condemned before Bobadilla left Spain. The third letter of the royal commissioner commanded Columbus in the name of the sovereigns to deliver up to Bobadilla all fortresses and ships. In the absence of Columbus and his brother, Bartholomew, Don Diego Columbus, supposing from Bobadilla's astounding insolence and violence, that he was a pretender like Aguado, desired delay until the Admiral could return to San Domingo, and requested that his credentials be produced. Instead of obeying his instructions, the commissioner proceeded in rapid succession to herald forth all three letters which he bore, though they were of graduated and alternative severity. His first act was to seek the favor of all criminals, rebels, and miscreants on the island, and he accordingly set free all the State prisoners, then proceeding on that line, he arrogantly proclaimed his promise to redress all grievances; he seized the residence of the Admiral and occupied it for himself, spoke on all occasions contemptuously of him, and vaunted his own authority to punish him. Columbus received tidings of Bobadilla's arrival and arrogant pro-

ceedings. While he was preparing to return to the city, his impatient enemy sent a messenger for him, and to show him a fourth letter of the sovereigns, brief and severe, which was addressed to the Admiral himself, and without an expression of courtesy or regret, without explanation or a soothing word, read as follows: "Don Christopher Colon, our Admiral of the Ocean Sea, we have charged the Commander Francis de Bobadilla, bearer of these presents, to make known to you in our names certain matters with which he is entrusted. We pray you to yield to him faith and credit, and to act accordingly." On receipt of such a curt letter from his sovereigns, and a peremptory summons from Bobadilla, he at once obeyed and repaired directly to San Domingo, where on his arrival, he was immediately seized by Bobadilla, thrown into prison and loaded with chains. The same treatment was meted out to Don Diego Columbus. When no one in Hispaniola could be found so mean and despicable as to be willing to place the chains upon the Admiral, Bobadilla found such an instrument in an ungrateful and degraded domestic of the Admiral himself. Fearing the resentment and the strong arm of the Adelantado, Don Bartholomew Columbus, Bobadilla was cowardly enough to request the imprisoned and chained Admiral to send an order to his brother to return to San Domingo and submit to his authority. This brave man obeyed his brother's order, returned to the city and was immediately thrown in prison, and in chains. The three brothers were imprisoned apart. Not only was the Admiral imprisoned and chained, he received actual ill-treatment in his helplessness, was deprived of part of his clothing, and placed on insufficient food. He had reason to fear momentary assassination at the hands of Bobadilla; for did not another royal commissioner, sent out by the same Fonseca, inflict judicial assassination afterwards, upon the famous Balboa, the discoverer of the Pacific Ocean?

Bobadilla and his minions scoured the country for accusations and affidavits against his noble prisoner, and he found no difficulty in accumulating an immense mass of perjured testimony, by which every crime, except the crime of impurity alone, was attributed to this fallen hero. When taken from his prison to be carried on ship-board, Columbus thought that he was taken from prison to be killed. He prepared himself for death. On board the ship, the *Gorda*, the heart of Vallejo, his guardian, was melted, and he proposed to remove the chains which Bobadilla had placed on the Admiral, but the latter refused to allow their removal. A reverend author already quoted thus describes the condition of this illustrious prisoner and fallen Admiral: "It was in the name of his sovereigns that he had been chained, and he would not permit any surreptitious alleviation of his sufferings. Wasted by dis-

ease and acute pain, worn out by labor, which never brought repose, accused of causing evils which he had done his best to prevent, tortured by the thought that the poor Indians, whose souls he would have poured out his life-blood to save, were being taught the vices of Christians instead of the doctrines of Christianity, and instead of being led to the waters of baptism, were being driven farther away from the love of Jesus Christ and the hope of Heaven, knowing in the bitterness of his soul, that the testimony of lazy vagabonds and convicted robbers was preferred to his, wounded to the heart by the defection of those who should have been most loyal, and forsaken at last by Isabella the Catholic, his spirit was still unbroken, and he was as great in the day of adversity, as he had been in the day of exaltation."

The following passage from Mr. John Fiske's "Discovery of America" is too forcible to be omitted: "The three brothers were confined in different places, nobody was allowed to visit them and they were not informed of the offences with which they were charged. While they lay in prison, Bobadilla busied himself with inventing an excuse for this violent behavior. Finally he hit upon one at which Satan from the depths of his bottomless pit must have grimly smiled. He said that he had arrested and imprisoned the brothers only because he had reason to believe that they were inciting the Indians to aid them in resisting the commands of Ferdinand and Isabella! In short, from the day of his landing, Bobadilla made common cause with the insurgent rabble, and when they had furnished him with a ream or so of charges against the Admiral and his brothers, it seemed safe to send these gentlemen to Spain. They were put on board ship, with their fetters upon them, and the officer in charge was instructed by Bobadilla to deliver them into the hands of Bishop Fonseca, who was thus to have the privilege of glutting to the full his revengeful spite."

But let us have no more details of this shocking business—Columbus was sent back from the New World, which he had given to Spain, in a Spanish ship, and was landed on Spanish soil, *in chains!*

When Christopher Columbus landed from the ship at Cadiz and walked through its thronged streets in chains, a profound and painful sensation was produced upon the minds of all: it was the same admiral, who in 1493, had entered Spain in triumph, and had stood, the discoverer of a world, before the Spanish sovereigns at Barcelona, and loaded with every honor. Every eye that saw that stately and venerable form bowed down with sorrow, and those hands which had achieved such exalted deeds loaded with chains, was moistened with tears, and every heart was beating in sympathy with the exalted prisoner. Bobadilla and Fonseca had overdone

their work. During his confinement and passage on the *Gorda* Columbus had written with his manacled hands, a letter to a friend at court, a friend of Isabella, Doña Juana de la Torre, nurse of Prince Juan, and from this letter, so full of pathetic fact and sentiment, we quote a brief passage: "If it is a new thing for me to complain of the world, at least there is nothing new in its mode of treating me. It has forced me a thousand times to join battle and I have always stood my ground till now, when neither good sword nor wise counsel can help me. It has cruelly flung me down. . . . The hope in Him who made us all sustains me. His aid is ever near." Doña Juana had read this letter to the Queen, and her eyes became tearful and her heart moved. She immediately despatched a courier to Cadiz to command the magistrate to strike off the chains from the hands of Columbus. Ferdinand, like his friend Fonseca, became alarmed, and he joined in a letter with the Queen to Columbus deploring the shameful misconstruction of the royal orders, and inviting him to court. Ferdinand resorted to the device of tyrants by disclaiming the acts of his subordinates. His subsequent history shows that his crafty heart was with them, and no doubt he had inspired their action. The volumes of perjury which Bobadilla had forwarded, refuted themselves by their excess, and made no impression. Columbus and his two brothers were received at court in a solemn audience, and the sovereigns bestowed upon them every mark of respect and endeavored to make public reparation for the wrongs perpetrated in their names. In a private audience to Columbus a few days later Isabella shed most copious tears, and promised him reimbursement for his losses and restoration of his vice-royalty and other dignities. This last promise was never fulfilled; but this was owing more to the malign influence of Fonseca at court than to the reason of state assigned, that it would be impolitic to entrust the government of such elements as constituted the Spanish rabble at Hispaniola to a foreigner. Mr. Fiske's description of Columbus, with the imprint of the fetters fresh on his wrists, at the Alhambra, is a manly tribute to the unfortunate: "The scene in the Alhambra, when Columbus arrived, is one of the most touching in history. Isabella received him with tears in her eyes, and then this much-enduring old man, whose proud and masterful spirit had so long been proof against all wrongs and insults, broke down. He threw himself at the feet of the sovereigns in an agony of tears and sobs." In speaking of the refusal of Columbus to let his chains be removed and the reaction in his favor, the same author says: "The event—which always justifies true manliness—proved the sagacity of his proud demeanor. Fonseca was balked of his gratification. The clumsy Bobadilla had overdone the business. The sight of the Admiral's

stately and venerable figure in chains, as he passed through the streets of Cadiz, on a December day of that year 1500, awakened a popular outburst of sympathy for him and indignation at his persecutors."

Royal promises, like other pledges of politicians, yield always to influence or policy. If Columbus had been restored to the vice-regal administration of Hispaniola and had been backed by an adequate military force, his foreign birth would not have stood in the way of his successful government. But Fonseca's influence prevailed again and another creature of his, Nicolas de Ovando, knight commander of the military and ecclesiastical order of Alcántara was appointed governor of Hispaniola. The administration under this new government was a full vindication of Columbus. Ovando by his despotism reduced the whites of Hispaniola to such a state of discipline and order as to gain for him the title of a good governor for white men. But his cruelties to the poor Indians, their spoliation and subjugation, their extermination in the most brutal, wanton and perfidious manner, contrast strangely with the milder and juster administration of Columbus. The feudal vassalage of the Indians established under Columbus had been carried under Bobadilla into the *repartimientos*, another name for a modified slavery, and under Ovando into the *encomiendas*, which constituted an unmitigated slavery accompanied with fiendish atrocities. Seldom, if ever, has history had to record such a slavery. Crushed at first with inordinate labor of an agricultural kind, after the discovery of the mines they were immured to cruellest toil therein. If we recall the rush of gold-seekers to California and Australia in modern times, we get a faint glimpse at the crowds of Spaniards hastening to Hispaniola. The miners of California and Australia mostly did their own work, but those of Hispaniola forced it upon an enslaved race with horrors and atrocities that would be incredible, but for the unimpeachable eye-witnesses who have revealed it to us. The only labor which the Spanish miners of 1500 performed was to use the lash. Indians were worked to death without remorse, as it was easy enough and cheap enough to get others. When the poor worm turned or curled up, terrible extermination was the immediate result. The knife or axe slaughtered the Indians by hundreds; other hundreds were burned alive; others still were impaled on sharp stakes, and hundreds were torn to pieces by blood-hounds. If a Spaniard was killed in retaliation, the tally could only be adjusted by calling up fifty or sixty Indians and chopping off their hands. To chop off their hands was nothing, since if they had both hands they were liable to slaughter at any moment. The lives of Indians were cheap indeed. Little Indian children, like kittens or puppies,

were thrown into the water to drown. On one occasion thirteen Indians were strung up in a row, just so high as to let their toes barely touch the ground, while their Spanish tormentors enjoyed the sport of pricking them with their sword-points, so as to prolong their death-writhing agonies. I refrain from mentioning the horrid blasphemies with which the number thirteen was selected by these unworthy Christians. On another occasion a white man was wantonly roasting a number of Indians suspended over a slow fire; and, when their hideous cries awakened a Spanish official in a neighboring house from his siesta-nap, and when he called out to his fellow-demon to kill those wretches at once, the latter coolly gagged the half-expiring innocents and prolonged their tortures and his own hellish enjoyment. The Indians of Hispaniola were exterminated by these hideous cruelties and wholesale slaughters. So much was this the case that Indian slaves became scarce, and expeditions went out to steal and decoy the poor inhabitants of other islands on board Spanish ships from which they were landed in the mines of Hispaniola and finally most pitilessly sacrificed to the Spaniards' demon of gold. This hideous story is not a tithe of the atrocities perpetrated by white men in the beginning of the sixteenth century in Hispaniola. Can all this be possible? the gentle reader may exclaim; can it be true? Yes, we have it all and sadly much more from the noble and truthful lips of the venerable Bishop Las Casas, who, when he beheld these barbarities, asked himself if it was not a frightful dream. But alas he had the reality before him; it was no dream; would to God, for the sake of our common humanity that it had been a dream! Bishop Las Casas assures us, after relating these countless atrocities of his own countrymen, "all this did I behold with my bodily mortal eyes." Read his "History of the Indies;" its recitals are the saddest pages of human history. In the fourth and last article of this series on Columbus, in the October number of the REVIEW, I shall relate how some Christians, who were not unworthy of that exalted title, raised their angelic voices on earth in opposition to such brutal atrocities, in protest against such an enslavement of man by man, and in vindication of the inalienable right of human liberty. The cruel administration of Ovando was ended by his recall to Spain, 1509, alas! that it should have lasted so long! There are only two things to be said in his favor—he returned to Spain poor, and he left the larger part of his moderate property for the founding of a hospital for needy Spaniards. Why could he not have bequeathed the smaller portion, at least, for the redemption of poor Indians from the power of their ruthless Spanish masters?

Stripped now of his office of Viceroy, from motives untenable on their face, and by actual results proved to be disastrous in the

selection and administration of Ovando in Hispaniola, the brave and energetic spirit of the veteran sailor and Admiral now sought the means and opportunities for a fourth voyage. It is interesting in our day of almost perfect geographical knowledge to recall the errors and speculations of the past. Vasco de Gama had certainly found the real and true continent of Asia, in the interests of Portugal, by sailing around the southern cape of Africa. The first, second and third voyages of Columbus had led to endless speculations as to what part of Asia he had discovered by sailing due west across the Atlantic; but Asia it was believed to be. On the second voyage, while off the coast of Cuba, by command of the Admiral, a notary accompanied by four witnesses proceeded through the crews of the four caravels to make a solemn record of the testimony and belief of every man in the expedition as to what land this was they saw before them, and upon which they had landed; and if any had a doubt as to its being Asia, and as to his power to land there and travel by land all the way back to Spain, now was his time to express his doubt. The notary and four witnesses received the solemn, unanimous and sworn declaration of every man in the expedition that this was no other than the coast of Asia. This solemn proceeding was formally reduced to writing and sworn to by all; it is dated June 12, 1494, and is still preserved in the Archives of the Indies at Seville. This was during the second voyage to the Indies. In the face of all this, where were the rich and prosperous cities of Marco Polo? where was Cipango? where was Ophir? where the Golden Chersonese or Malacca? where Cathay? where Champa or Cochin China? where Japan? where the Indian Ocean? where the domains of the Grand Khan; where the kingdom of Prester John? The recent voyage of Americus Vesputius and Ojeda along the coast of a great continent, extending as far south as what we now know to be the Gulf of Maracaibo, still more befogged the momentous question. In his third voyage to the Indies, Columbus presented the noble spectacle of a single man endeavoring to solve by personal explorations the problem of the earth. The geography of the earth is one thing and the shape of the planet is another. By the former are located and measured the oceans, seas, gulfs, bays and rivers, the continents, islands, peninsulas, isthmuses and other parts of the earth. By the latter is determined, by the principles of applied physical astronomy, the necessary and natural shape of the earth as a planet, forming a part of, and in harmony with, the rest of the planetary system. The science of physical astronomy, as subsequently unfolded by Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler and Newton, was then comparatively unknown. The genius of Columbus, by actual exploration and investigation, was doing the pioneer work of his

race in geography, and was even approaching the applied elements of physical geometry. He had to overcome the errors of the great scientists of his own and of all ages. Hence when he was struggling through the tides and currents near the coast of Paria, breaking through the errors of Toscanelli's map, he reasoned himself into the conviction that the lands he was then discovering formed a continent. We know now, upon scientific grounds unknown in his day, subject always to God's omnipotent power of creation in his own way, that there is but one shape possible for our planet, a once fluid or nebulous mass, which, in due time and place, assumed the planetary duty of rotation, which only shape is that of a spheroid, a little protuberant at the equator and flattening at the poles. Now when he was struggling with his ships up that protuberant rise at the equator, he concluded that this shape must show the earth to be shaped like a pear, rather than like an orange, and must have an apex at the equator like the stem part of a pear, while its lower part was nearly spherical. He saw and felt that he was ascending a gentle slope, as he sailed out of the scorching and smooth sea of the late dead calm; he saw the lovely and enchanting coasts and the rushing tide of the mighty river; he therefore concluded that he was approaching the region of the earthly paradise, and that the Garden of Eden was located on the top of the pear-shaped apex of the earth, and that if he ascended the great river before him he could reach the earthly home of our first parents. Had not Dante located Paradise on a lofty mountain? He gave bold expression to his theory in one of his characteristic letters, and quoted many authorities to sustain it. When he saw the distant land at the delta of the Orinoco, he called it *Isla Santa*, or Holy Island; it was one of the outposts of Eden. His theory was based upon a common opinion in the Middle Ages. He believed that by sailing to the west of that point he should reach the coast of Cochin China, and that the coast on which he had now arrived was either continuous with it, or separated by a strait through which he might sail to the Indian Ocean. His faith in his ability to reach the coast of Hindustan by his western route, which Gama had just reached by the eastern route, was firm as a rock; so much so that he again renewed his vow to the Sovereign Pontiff to furnish an army for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. It was during this interesting period of his life that he compiled that remarkable book, his "Collection of Prophecies Concerning the Recovery of Jerusalem and the Discovery of the Indies," which we mentioned in the first of this series of articles. Mr. Fiske tersely describes the then interesting and highly wrought condition of the Admiral's mind, in these striking words: "It was no doubt the symptom of a reaction

against his misfortunes that he grew more and more mystical in these days, consoling himself with the belief that he was a chosen instrument in the hands of Providence for enlarging the bounds of Christendom."

These observations will enable the gentle reader to clearly comprehend the sentiments, beliefs, motives, aspirations and purposes with which Columbus undertook his fourth voyage to the new world. It consisted of four small caravels of from fifty to seventy tons, and the entire personnel numbered about one hundred and fifty men. He was now again consoled by the strengthening companionship of his brave and faithful brother, Bartholomew, and cheered by the congenial company of his younger son, Fernando, a youth of fourteen. The expedition sailed from Cadiz on May 11, 1502. As Hispaniola was left in great disorder by the misrule of Bobadilla, and many enemies of Columbus were still there, for fear of fresh commotions, he was instructed not to stop at San Domingo on the outward voyage, but might stop there on the return. Hence, on reaching Martinique and Dominica his intention was to sail for Jamaica, thence to his Cochin China, our Cuba, and thence southward along his continuous continental coast until he should solve the great question of an inter-continental passage of water, and, if found, to sail through it into the Indian Ocean. But as one of his vessels was unseaworthy, necessity compelled him to go to San Domingo to get another vessel for his momentous voyage. When he arrived in the harbor he found a squadron of twenty-six or twenty-eight ships about to sail for Spain, and among the passengers were his enemy Bobadilla and the former rebel Roldan. The ships carried an immense quantity of gold acquired by the enslaved toil of the Indians under Bobadilla, and on a ship by itself was the gold belonging to Columbus, four thousand pieces, a part probably of the promised restitution. The practiced eye of this veteran sailor saw indications of an approaching storm. He conveyed this important information to the authorities with warnings to the fleet not to sail, and requested permission to obtain a ship in place of the unseaworthy one in his own fleet. His request and warnings were treated with contempt, and he was ordered away from the very city he had founded, and from the harbor of safety for his ships in the storm he had predicted several days beforehand. The fleet with Bobadilla, Roldan and many other enemies of Columbus put to sea. The predicted storm came as he had warned them; it was a hurricane. Almost the entire fleet was wrecked; Bobadilla, Roldan and all the enemies of Columbus and the ill-gotten treasure were sent to the bottom. The only ship that arrived safely in Spain was the one that carried the Admiral's gold. He had himself the further comfort of riding the storm in

safety when all others perished, and he proceeded on his voyage. Las Casas witnessed these remarkable and miraculous events with awe and reverence.

The casualties of the sea carried his fleet to the Island of Guanaja and Cape Honduras. The fleet sailed south and eastward in search of the inter-continental strait from the end of Honduras to the beginning of Nicaragua. Veragua was passed, and the voyage continued upon information derived from the natives as to the existence of the peninsula on the east side of which he was, and that on the other side was another great sea by which he concluded he would reach the Ganges in ten days; the Indians also informed him that his present course would bring him to a narrow place between the two oceans. Columbus thus got the first tidings of the Pacific Ocean; was he not its virtual discoverer? Observations were made during this cruise of the countries passed and their inhabitants; evidences of a semi-civilization were seen all around; copper knives and hatchets, artistic pottery, fine and beautifully dyed cotton cloths, the chicha or maize beer, heavy and powerful weapons, and women dressed as modestly as the Moorish women of Granada, great houses built of stone and adobe mortar, walls adorned with carvings and picturegraphs, well preserved mummies, and abundance of gold, with rich ornaments of which the natives were plentifully adorned. Columbus proceeded on his course east of Puerto Bello and found that the two oceans were divided from each other by a narrow strip of land, now known as the Isthmus of Panama, and not connected together by a pass through which he could reach Hindustan and the Indian Ocean. He turned his prows and retraced his course.

While Columbus sought only to ascertain the true geography of the earth, at this important point, it was a disappointment to him that no passage was found to the regions so lately discovered by Gama. It was an important service rendered to human knowledge to have thus settled the momentous question. His enemies then and now have accused him of a lust for gold. Let them now behold him passing by the rich gold-bearing regions of this extended coast without stopping to seek or acquire it, for he was in search of the solution of a great and geographical, scientific and commercial problem. Washington Irving thus notices this important cruise and its motives: "Nothing could evince more clearly his generous ambition than hurrying in this brief manner along a coast where wealth was to be gathered at every step for the purpose of seeking a strait, which, however, it might produce vast benefit to mankind, could yield nothing else to himself than the glory of the discovery."

Debarred as he was from going to San Domingo, where he had

founded his colony, and having ascertained that no inter-oceanic passage to Eastern Asia existed, Columbus resolved to found another colony, and selected for this purpose the region known as Veragua, reputed as so rich in gold. It was this place which gave the name to the dukedom of Veragua, which was afterwards conferred upon his family in lieu of all hereditary titles. The cruise down and up the coast was attended with frequent and severe storms; on one occasion the Adelantado and his crew attended Mass and received the sacraments on shore from the only priest, Father Alexander, a Franciscan, while the other crews, fearing immediate shipwreck, confessed to each other and prepared for death. Columbus was prostrated with sickness; a boat's crew perished in the waves; the Franciscan Father died, and the Admiral, his young son, his brother, and all the crews gave themselves up as lost. A huge waterspout was approaching the ships and threatened instant destruction to all. The sailors on their knees recited the Gospel of St. John; the prostrate Admiral made a last effort and recited with a loud voice the opening passages of the same Gospel, and made the sign of the cross with his sword; Las Casas relates that the waterspout turned aside. The coast was named the Coast of Contradictions, from its numerous disappointments, sufferings and misfortunes.

Having arrived at the river Belen, in Veragua, on January 6, 1503, the ships crossed the bar. Columbus was unable to move from his bed, but the Adelantado made a military expedition to the village of the cacique Quibian, and found him and his people hostile, crafty and deceptive. Gold abounded in great quantities, but the wily Quibian led the Spaniards to the mines of a neighboring chief with whom he was at war, and where there was less gold than in his own country. Diego Mendez, a faithful and gallant follower of the Admiral, made an expedition into Quibian's country and reported a conspiracy of the chief and his tribe to assail and destroy the Spaniards; then the Adelantado made another expedition and captured the chief and his family; Diego Mendez and Bartholomew Columbus, in these and other perilous services, seemed to have charmed lives. The indomitable cacique made his escape, though chained and tied with ropes, and secretly prosecuted his hostile preparations. Columbus deemed it necessary to carry his ships beyond the bar of the river for safety, leaving within one ship and a garrison on shore. An attack on the feeble garrison was repulsed with almost superhuman valor; a boat's crew sent by the Admiral for water were all murdered but one man, who swam ashore and gave the alarm. The position of the whole expedition was perilous beyond hope; to remain was to meet certain death from the natives—to go to sea in worm-eaten

ships were certain shipwreck. Columbus, now prostrated with disease, suffered intense mental agony for the safety of his brother and people on shore, and for his son and himself, and his ships. It was with the utmost difficulty and peril that he succeeded in rescuing his brother and the rest of the garrison on shore from the fierce and murderous attacks of the infuriated Indians. In his despondency delirium seized the Admiral; he regarded it as a vision, for in it he heard a messenger from heaven admonish him, "O! foolish and slow of heart!" "He was then reminded," says Father Knight, "of the mercies which God had shown him, and finally encouraged with the inspiring words, 'Fear not! have confidence! all these tribulations are written on marble and not without cause.'"

Compelled to abandon one of his caravels, the *Galician*, to its fate at Belen, he succeeded in rescuing his brother and the remnants of the garrison. Having sailed from this inhospitable shore, they had not proceeded far before another ship had to be abandoned. All the crews were crowded on two ships. They were now seeking safety at San Domingo. The ships were perforated with holes made by the worms. As the water poured into the ships, the men worked incessantly at the pumps day and night. It seemed as though they could not even reach San Domingo—surely they would not be repulsed from that, his own port, as they had been thence repulsed by Ovando on the outward voyage. Having reached a group of islands on the coast of Cuba, the ships were further disabled in a violent storm. He procured some provisions from the shore and again made for San Domingo. But it was impossible to proceed in such miserable shells, and to save the lives of all on board, he was compelled to run the vessels ashore in a bay on the island of Jamaica. The two stranded ships were so full of water that they would have sunk very soon. Columbus regarded the saving of his crews as a miracle. The ships settled firmly in the sand and became a fortress for the wrecked Admiral and his companions. The faithful and expert Diego Mendez won the favor of the natives, and secured from them provisions.

Columbus spent an entire year of exile on the island, where he was shipwrecked—it was a terrible year. The faithful and brave Diego Mendez volunteered to make the hazardous trip in a canoe across the sea from Jamaica to Hispaniola, and in his second attempt accomplished the perilous feat. Ovando was appealed to to save his countrymen from their perilous position. He made promises of relief, but as Mr. Fiske justly states: "He was a slippery knave, who knew how to deal out promises without taking the first step toward fulfilment." After eight months Ovando sent

one Escobar, one of Roldan's rebels, an enemy of Columbus, to go on the tantalizing trip of approaching and looking at the shipwrecked Admiral and Spaniards, and then departing without giving them other relief than a barrel of wine and a side of bacon. Well has the question been asked, was not Ovando seeking the destruction of his rival?

But such was the cross that Columbus had to bear, that to the perils and hardships of shipwreck and exile on a savage coast, was added the revolt of his own men under two brothers named Porras, and the infusion of disaffection and hostility among the natives. A sorry sight it was when Spaniards approached the savages of Jamaica with inducements to withhold food from, and finally to attack and murder, their shipwrecked countrymen. Columbus, himself stricken with disease, was abandoned by most of the able bodied men of the garrison, and left with few others than invalids like himself. The Adelantado was a tower of strength, however. The rebels seized the small boats of the Admiral and made three attempts to row across the sea to Hispaniola, but three times the waves repulsed the dastards. Returning to the island they overran the country as robbers, outlaws, and marauders; they were likened to a pestilence.

Under such circumstances the Indians refused the usual supplies of food to the Admiral and his faithful companions, for all which when supplied, they were amply repaid. In order to relieve the garrison from starvation, the Admiral, whose active mind was fertile in expedients even when racked by disease, resorted to an exceedingly ingenious device in order to obtain food from the natives. He predicted beforehand an approaching eclipse of the moon, in order to work upon the fears of the natives, and so exactly did the moon become obscured at the very moment foretold by him, that the Indians, so deeply impressed with his supernatural knowledge and communion with the heavens, commenced at once to bring in the usual supplies, for which the Admiral paid them as before. Some of the invalids who were obliged to remain with the Admiral by their illness and weakness, as soon as they grew strong on the food he procured for them, joined the rebellion of the Porras brothers. Using to their advantage the strange appearance and departure of Escobar in the ship, the rebels pretended and announced that the Admiral had conjured up a phantom ship, to deceive his followers with false hopes. Negotiations with the rebels resulted in nothing, so that the resolute and brave Adelantado marched against them with fifty men, recent invalids but high-spirited men, with an ultimatum, the answer to which was a fierce onslaught of the rebels. But the Adelantado and his few brave Spaniards completely routed the more numerous, and

more robust band of rebels, and he took the chief a prisoner with his own hands.

When Ovando saw the agent and friends of Columbus raising a ship at the Admiral's expense to go for him and his men, he yielded to the popular and general outcry against himself, which resounded even from the very pulpits of San Domingo, and added another ship of the government. Now, as on many other occasions, the extreme cruelty of the Admiral's enemies, caused a reaction in his favor. He generously took on board the ships with himself and his true friends the rebels, who had yielded to his sway only when subdued. They all arrived in a starving condition at San Domingo, on August 13, 1504. A strange and mixed crowd greeted the return of the Admiral at the city he had founded, and divers were the sentiments of this diversified assembly. Among them was young Hernando Cortes, the future conqueror of Mexico, a kinsman of Ovando, and a warm admirer all his life of Columbus. Father Knight remarks that, "he too found an enemy in Fonseca." Ovando, in deference to public sentiment, pretended to receive Columbus with joy and to treat him with respect; but his true sentiments were made known by his conduct, for he immediately liberated Porras, and threatened punishment to the faithful followers of the Admiral for killing some of the rebels. Columbus's heart recoiled at the atrocities he saw and heard of in Hispaniola, but could not prevent them. He could place no trust in Ovando as regards his own position. He availed himself of the first opportunity of returning to Spain. He carried with him and paid the expenses of the very men who had wronged him so much in his exile, even when he was in want of means for himself. After a stormy voyage, and a narrow escape from another shipwreck, he arrived at the port of San Lucar de Barremeda, on November 7, 1504, and made his way to Seville. He was now broken in health and fortunes. It seems miraculous that the old Admiral could have survived such misfortunes, hardships, and sufferings; that he should have arrived again in Spain alive.

Had he not now fulfilled his destiny, and performed the prophecy? *Circumspice!* Look around and see the continents and nations that Columbus discovered. His glory survives his enemies. The old and the new worlds unite to do him homage. Four hundred years have not obscured his fame, but have exalted his name. The New World, which he gave to Leon and to Castile, and to the world, has emerged from thralldom, and achieved its liberties. Now the free and grateful nations celebrate the great event, which, four hundred years ago, was achieved by Christopher Columbus.

TE DEUM LAUDAMUS.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

THE HIERARCHY IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES.

WE have taken this as a brief and convenient title for the present article, though it requires some explanation in order to make clear what our precise thesis will be. It literally denotes only the constitution of the sacred ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church, with a very common restriction to the order of bishops as being the chief pastors.

Viewed as a mere question of polity, episcopacy would not be of vital and essential importance apart from other questions relating to the nature and attributes of the historical episcopate. In point of fact, however, the question of the origin of the episcopate in the early Church is connected with so many doctrines and religious practices of the highest importance, and in such a way, that the determination of this question determines implicitly the whole issue between two radically diverse and opposite theories of the Christian religion, the Catholic and the Protestant. At any period in ancient Christianity, when episcopacy was undoubtedly in possession, essential and substantial Catholicism surrounded it as the full-orbed sphere surrounds its centre. Wherever episcopacy exists as an order instituted by the Apostles, the episcopal character is believed to be conferred by an ordination imparting a grace transmitted through an unbroken succession of bishops from Jesus Christ. This grace is believed to be the plenitude of sacerdotal gifts, including power to consecrate and offer the Eucharist as a true sacrifice, to consecrate priests, and to do all other acts properly belonging to the office of a chief pastor and ruler in the Church. This doctrine of the sacramental and sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry is one part of the general doctrine of the sacramental nature of the Christian Church, of sacramental grace in general, of the entire system of Catholicism as opposed to Protestantism. The true, genuine concept of hierarchy in the highest grade of the Christian priesthood—*i.e.*, in the apostolic episcopate, of which the supreme pontificate is the culminating point—implies the hierarchical nature of the other orders of baptized Christians and of the whole Church in all its members who have been made, through the redemption of Christ, “a kingdom and priests unto God.”

This is the comprehensive sense in which we use the term “hierarchy” in the title of this article, as denoting the whole sacred order, dogmatic and moral, in the organic unity of the Catholic

Church, of which the existence of the apostolic episcopate is the sign and mark.

The precise point to be proved is, that the episcopate is no merely ecclesiastical institution developed from a mere presbyterate, but a divine and truly sacerdotal order, founded by Jesus Christ in the Apostles, and through them continued in the bishops of the Catholic Church and their successors, but pre-eminently in the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter in his supreme primacy.

The method we have chosen to follow in our argument is to select an early date in the history of the Church, at which, by the confession of the best non-Catholic scholars, the episcopate and Catholicism were in possession, and to trace backward the path of Christian movement to its origin.

The exact point of departure from which to begin this process may be taken at an earlier or a later date, between A. D. 150 and A. D. 325, without sensibly affecting the premises or the conclusion of the argument. For the sake of convenience, we will take the date A. D. 200, the last year of the second century.

At this date, Victor I. was Bishop of Rome, Septimius Severus was Emperor, St. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons and nearing the period of his martyrdom, Tertullian was forty years of age and in the prime of his Catholic life, Clement of Alexandria had just closed his career as the head of the Catechetical School, and Origen was a promising boy of fifteen. Polycrates was Bishop of Ephesus, and the dissensions respecting the observance of Easter were at their height. It was somewhere near this date that St. Dionysius of Alexandria and St. Cyprian were born. The interval of comparative rest for the Church from persecution, from A. D. 180 to 202, was near its end, and the fifth great persecution under Severus about to begin. The evangelization of England, had, perhaps, commenced under Pope Elutherius with the conversion of the tribal chieftain, Lucius, and a considerable number of Britons. Christianity was widely spread and rapidly progressing through the Roman Empire and beyond. In Asia Minor, proconsular Africa, Egypt, Gaul, Spain, Germany, and throughout the east, there were numerous churches, some of which were very flourishing, and the multitude of Christians was great. The epoch was momentous. The third century, which witnessed such a vast extension of Christianity and its most fearful and decisive struggle with heathenism, ending after one hundred and thirteen years in a triumphant victory, was beginning. This was emphatically the age of martyrdom, glorious in its Christian heroes and sages; its countless host of confessors of the faith; its foundations, cemented in blood, upon which the colossal edifice of Christendom was built in later ages.

Surely it is a deeply interesting question: What was the Chris-

religion, in its faith and its organic constitution, at this moment when it was emerging from its childhood of one hundred years since the death of the last of the Apostles who nurtured its infancy, and was coming forth in the vigor of its youth, armed with its panoply, for the invasion and conquest of heathendom? It is this religion which is the genuine, real, and historical Christianity,—a world-power and a world-religion. Any different sort of Christianity is spurious, a mere creature of theory, and (in so far as it has received any concrete embodiment in modern times) a new and human invention, whose authors have no lineage among the ancient saints and martyrs.

It is a plain and indisputable historical fact that the Christianity of the year 200 was Catholicism. The salient feature and certain mark of its integral, organic composition is found in its hierarchical constitution, as a universal confederation of episcopal churches, with the Roman See as the centre of unity.

The episcopal constitution of the churches throughout Christendom is the first and main point to be considered, after which follows the Roman primacy as the keystone of the unity of the universal episcopate.

Episcopacy was in universal and indisputable possession before the beginning of the third century, according to the most eminent Protestant scholars. We will take two of these, among the latest and most learned representatives of modern Protestant scholarship, Lightfoot and Harnack, as sufficient authorities in support of our assertion.

Some may object to Lightfoot as an Episcopalian and a bishop in the Church of England. But this is not a valid objection to him as a witness without Catholic bias. He was no High Churchman with semi-Catholic proclivities, but a thorough-going Protestant, having no belief in the Sacrament of Order and the Christian priesthood. His opinions about the origin and nature of primitive episcopacy are those which were commonly held by the earliest continental Reformers, are maintained by many of the best non-episcopal divines at the present time, and are most decidedly un-Catholic opinions.

Dr. Lightfoot, after a careful survey of the period preceding our chosen date of A. D. 200, remarks:

“The notices thus collected present a large body of evidence establishing the fact of the early and extensive adoption of episcopacy in the Christian Church. The investigation, however, would not be complete unless attention were called to such indirect testimony as is furnished by the tacit assumptions of writers living towards and at the close of the second century. *Episcopacy is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like*

*Irenæus and Tertullian, that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not.*¹ Even Irenæus, the earlier of these, who was certainly born and probably had grown up before the middle of the century, seems to be wholly ignorant that the word bishop had passed from a lower to a higher value since the apostolic times. Nor is it important only to observe the positive (though indirect) testimony which they afford. Their silence suggests a strong negative presumption, that while every other point of doctrine or practice was eagerly canvassed, the form of church government alone scarcely came under discussion."²

We may remark in passing that this last statement, evidently a just one, cannot be explained except on the presumption that the Apostles established everywhere episcopal government.

"Unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that *early in the second century* the episcopal office was firmly and widely established. Thus, *during the last three decades of the first century*, and, consequently, during the lifetime of the latest surviving Apostle, this change must have been brought about.

"In this way, during the historical blank which extends over half a century after the fall of Jerusalem (from A. D. 70 to A. D. 120), episcopacy was matured and the Catholic Church consolidated."³

We have then, according to Lightfoot, in A. D. 200, episcopacy as the universal church polity, already old, and having a tradition behind it going backward toward the "historical blank" which separates the year 120 from the year 70 in respect to its origin, and to the year 120 for its firm and wide establishment.

Dr. Lightfoot has also a testimony to papal power at the close of the second century :

"With Victor, the successor of Elutherius (A. D. 189), a new era begins. Apparently the first Latin prelate who held the metropolitan see of Latin Christendom, he was, moreover, the first Roman bishop who is known to have had intimate relations with the imperial court, and the first also *who advanced those claims to universal dominion* which his successors in later ages have always consistently and often successfully maintained. 'I hear,' writes Tertullian scornfully, 'that an edict has gone forth, aye, and that a peremptory edict; the chief pontiff forsooth, I mean the bishop of bishops, has issued his commands.' At the end of the first century the Roman Church was swayed by the mild and peaceful

¹ Here, and in all other quoted passages where italics are used, they are from the writer of the article.

² *Comm. on Philipp.*, p. 227.

³ *Id.*, pp. 201, 207.

counsels of the Presbyter-bishop Clement ; the close of the second witnessed the autocratic pretensions of the haughty Pope Victor, the prototype of a Hildebrand or an Innocent."¹

Even Daillé and other writers of the second generation of French Protestants, who attacked so vehemently the apostolic institution of episcopacy, allowed that it was established *as early* as the beginning of the third century. Of these, Lightfoot remarks :

"The strange audacity of writers like Daillé, who placed the establishment of episcopacy *as late* as the beginning of the third century, need not detain us."

Prof. Harnack, of Berlin University, is the first man among the rationalists, who are nominally and officially doctors in the Lutheran Church of Germany. In his remarkable work on the "History of Dogma," he undertakes to trace the origin and progress of Catholicism.

Dr. Harnack does not say in so many words that the episcopal constitution of the churches was universal in the year 200. It is implied, however, in many passages, that it was so, long before that time. He writes :

"It is plain that *towards the end* of the third century the development—apart from communities situated in the outer circumference—almost everywhere had reached the same final point, Catholicism, essentially in the sense which we to-day attach to the word, has been attained in the great majority of the communities. It becomes now probable *a priori* that this revolution of Christianity, which is indeed nothing else than the projection of the Gospel upon the world-wide empire of the period, has been accomplished under the guidance of the community of the capital city of the world, the Roman Church ; and that, therefore, 'Roman' and 'Catholic' have from the beginning stood in a special mutual relation."

It is a question here of something more than episcopacy, viz., of a close confederation of dioceses in provinces, and of provinces in exarchates and patriarchates. The churches of the periphery are those of Edessa, Nisibis, etc., to the east of the great patriarchate of Antioch and beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. We know that all the churches founded by Apostles or later apostolic missionaries in the remotest parts were episcopal and

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 224. The references are to the edition of 1890. It must be remembered that when Tertullian wrote these words he had already become a schismatic and a heretic. Perhaps some of the Corinthian schismatics may have used similar language of Pope Clement I.

² *The Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., St. Ignatius, vol. i., p. 391, London, McMillan, 1889.

in Catholic communion. Hence, they are no exception to the rule.

Dr. Harnack further says :

"The assumption that Paul and Peter labored in Rome and founded the Roman Church (Dionysius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Caius), must have lent an eminent distinction to the Roman bishops at the moment in which the bishops came to the front as the more or less sovereign lords of the churches, and were recognized as the successors of the Apostles."¹

The specifications under this head refer to Pope Victor and his immediate successors, and even look back to his predecessors.

All through the exposition of his theory of the gradual construction of Catholicism, it is to the second century that he ascribes the growth of the ecclesiastical organization, specifying the causes which in his opinion produced the result :

"That out of the Christian congregations a real confederation under the primacy of the Roman congregation came into existence" (p. 407).

It is his opinion that :

"First in consequence of the so-called Gnostic crisis (second half of the second century), which in every sense made an epoch, a firm organization was attained, and the apostolic-episcopal constitution founded" (p. 183).

Nevertheless, he says that :

"The determining premises for the development of Catholicism were present already before the middle of the second century" (p. 185).

"The second century of the existence of Gentile Christian congregations received its stamp through the victorious warfare with Gnosticism and the Marcionite Church, through the gradual formation of an ecclesiastical doctrine, through the suppression of the old Christian enthusiasm, all in all through the establishment of a great ecclesiastical bond, which, as being alike a political community, a school, and an association for worship, reposed upon the firm foundation of an 'apostolic' rule of faith, an 'apostolic' collection of Scriptures, and, in fine, also an 'apostolic' organization, the Catholic Church" (p. 273).

"From two converging lines of development arose Catholic Christianity. In the one, fixed external criteria were established for the definition of what was Christian, and these criteria were proclaimed as *apostolical* institutions. The baptismal confession was

¹ *Lehrb. der Dogm.—Gesch.* xiii., 1. Excurs. zum 2 und 3, Kap., pp. 400, et seq.

elevated into an *apostolical* rule of faith, otherwise an apostolical law of faith; from the writings read in churches an *apostolical* collection of Scriptures was formed and placed on an equal footing with the Old Testament; the constitution of a monarchical episcopate was given out as *apostolical*, and the quality of successors of the Apostles was ascribed to the bishops; the worship, finally, was shaped into a mysterious celebration, which was likewise referred back to the Apostles. A strictly exclusive church, having the character of a doctrinal, religious, and administrative corporation, was the result of these institutions, a confederation which, in increasing measure, drew the congregations into itself and caused all irreconcilable formations to shrink away. The confederation rested finally upon a common confession, but not only was this conceived to be a 'law,' but was very speedily completed by new criteria. To point out in consequence of what necessity the publication of a new canon of Scripture came about, what circumstances demanded the establishment of living authorities in the congregations, and in what mutual relations apostolic rule of faith, apostolic canon of Scripture and apostolic office were placed, is one of the most important tasks of the investigation of the history of dogma, which however cannot, unfortunately, be perfectly fulfilled. The development ended with the construction of a clerical estate, at the head of which stood the bishops who united in themselves all conceivable powers as teachers, priests, and judges, controlled all the forces of Christianity, guaranteed the purity of the same, and thus became in every respect the guardians of the Christian laity" (pp. 275, 276).

"The clergy held complete dominion over the congregations from the beginning of the second third of the third century" [A. D. 233] (p. 287).

The second line of development is that of the formation of a dogmatic and philosophical theology, the finding of a formula of reconciliation between faith and science. In a long exposition of this process of dogmatic development, together with that of ecclesiastical development, Dr. Harnack endeavors to show how the Christianity was formed which conquered the world, gave a solution of the intellectual and moral problems which controlled thought for centuries, and became an empire within the political empire of the Roman world,—in a word, Catholicism. The Imperial Church, Catholicism, was finished, he says, at the time when Diocletian undertook the reorganization of the Roman Empire (p. 380).

Enough has been said to justify the position taken at the beginning of this article, that at the date A. D. 200 the episcopal organization was in universal and undisputed possession throughout the Church.

It remains now to show that the organization of the Church under bishops, who were the chiefs of the clergy and congregations, was strictly hieratic and hierarchical. Sacerdotal or hieratic consecration and character, sacerdotal or hierarchical order and government, were of the essence of Christianity, principally existing in the Catholic episcopate, according to the theoretical and practical idea of Christianity in the second century.

The hieratic, sacerdotal character of the whole Church, in virtue of which all its members partake in a royal priesthood, is often put in opposition to the idea of the priestly character and office of the clergy. But the truth is, that it is precisely this common priesthood of Christians which is the reason why their chiefs must have a special priesthood. The Church is one great sacrament. It is not necessary to prove, what is manifest and undeniable, that baptism has always been regarded as the laver of regeneration, a sacrament imprinting an indelible character, imparting sanctifying grace, and giving the recipient a right to the kingdom of heaven. By this sacrament a Christian is specially consecrated in body and soul to the service of God in the Church, and bound in a sacred fellowship with all other children of God in the one mystical body of Christ. This mystical body, originating in a sacrament, must have a continuation and increase of sacramental life and communion, organic functions and ministries, a diversity of integral parts and members, all in conformity with its essence. It being hieratic in its essence, there must be hierarchical order in its constitution. Its principal organs and members must have special hieratic qualities and functions, just as the organs of the body of man, because he is a rational animal, must be specially endowed and fitted to subserve his exercise of all the operations of sensitive and intellectual life.

In like manner the sacerdotal character of the Head of the Church, Jesus Christ, is made an argument against the sacerdotal character of His ministers, whereas it proves the reverse. Jesus Christ is Prophet, Priest, and King, in and over the Church. He is the "Apostle and High Priest" of the household of God, a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedech. For this very reason His ministers must have a prophetic, sacerdotal, and royal character and office.

He formed His Church primarily and principally in His Apostles. The gifts which He possessed by a native right, especially the fulness of the Holy Spirit, He imparted to them, and through them to the multitude of the faithful. The Church was formed by a participation in the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles. The essence of the apostolic character and office was priesthood in all its plenitude, including the prophetic and royal attributes which

spring from it and give it perfection, and culminating in the supreme apostolate of St. Peter. This plenitude of the priesthood the bishops of the second century, with the full assent of all the faithful, claimed to have inherited by episcopal consecration through a direct and unbroken succession from the Apostles; and the successor of St. Peter in the Roman See likewise claimed to have inherited by virtue of that succession the prerogatives of his universal episcopate.

The spinal column of the complete, integral, organic constitution of the priesthood is the right and power of offering sacrifice to God, as the special and supreme act of worship, thanksgiving, expiation, and impetration. Priest and sacrifice are correlated terms. Jesus Christ is a Priest, or rather He is *the* Priest, anointed and consecrated by the Holy Spirit, primarily and specially, as being set apart and devoted to the offering up of Himself, the Lamb of God, the Divine Victim, by His death and the shedding of His blood on the Cross, in obedience to the command of His Father. By this act of obedience He rendered a homage to the sovereign majesty and dominion of God, of infinite worth, equal to the worthiness and right of God to receive the worship due from the creation to the Creator, from dependent beings to their absolute Lord, to receive from His works the glory which is their final cause. In this worship is included a return of thanksgiving equal to the value of the gifts conferred by the love and goodness of God on all His creatures, a condign satisfaction for all the sins of the world by which He was deprived of the glory due to Him, and an impetration founded on an equivalent merit of all the graces which the Divine Redeemer chose to ask for all those in whose name He appeared as Mediator before the face of His Father.

Priests and sacrifices in the Old Law were only foreshadowings of the one and sole Priest and Victim, Jesus Christ. He alone is, by intrinsic character, a Priest, offering an intrinsically meritorious sacrifice, *i.e.*, Himself, in one oblation only once offered (in its principal act and mode) by blood-shedding and death, as a Victim on the Cross. He alone can continue the great act of His priesthood, in the New Law, by an oblation in another and secondary mode of the same Victim, Himself, which continues and applies in a mystical manner (without any repetition of the blood-shedding and death accomplished once for all upon the altar of the Cross) the offering of the merit of His obedience to the Father, in worship, thanksgiving, expiation, and intercession. He alone could and did institute the Sacrifice of the New Law, and He alone could and did offer up to God, and give to His disciples, His own sacred body and precious blood, under the species of bread and wine, in the first celebration of the Eucharist. The Apostles could repeat

this act of consecrating and offering the Eucharist and giving it to the faithful only by receiving from Christ a communication of His priestly character and power. They could transmit this character to others only by virtue of an additional power communicated to them by Christ and in the way prescribed by Him. They could only act as His ministers, vicariously, and inasmuch as He had appointed and promised to exercise His power through the medium of their agency when He commissioned them as His legates and representatives.

Priesthood in the Christian Church is correlated to the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Jesus Christ, present in the consecrated species of bread and wine in the Eucharist, by that very act and by the nature of the solemn rite which represents and renews the sacrifice of the Cross, is there in the attitude of the Lamb of God who has been slain, offering His merits before the face of His Father. The specific character of Christian priesthood is therefore the power to consecrate the Eucharist. The Cross of Mount Calvary is the central object of the Christian religion. The Eucharistic altar represents it in the Christian temple. It is the central spot in the building. The walls, aisles, decorations, and towers are the environment of the altar. The Church is a place for the offering of the Sacrifice of the New Law, in which all rites and observances culminate. The Holy Eucharist is the sacrament of unity. The Catholic Church is one, chiefly by offering through the ministry of priests, in unity of faith, hope, charity, and apostolic fellowship, this mystic oblation in which the principal Priest is one and the Victim one; and by being united with one another, with Christ, and with the Father, in the Holy Spirit, by sacramental communion.

When the Sovereign Pontiff celebrates at the high altar of St. Peter's, with the princes of the Church and the ministering clergy around him, in the presence of a multitude of the faithful, the Church as one, holy, catholic and apostolic, is most perfectly represented and realized.

Jesus Christ, elevated on the Cross, drew all men to Himself around the Cross. The Pope, at the altar, draws all the faithful to himself as the Vicar of Christ, the High Priest. Every bishop celebrating at the high altar of his cathedral, with his clergy and people around him, likewise represents and realizes the unity of the Church. And the priest in an humble village church exemplifies the same universal fact. There is a multiplication of sacramental species, but only one Lamb who is offered and received undivided by each communicant. There is a multitude of individual priests but only one priesthood, in which all share with the Supreme Pontiff the sacerdotal honor and power, and with whom all the faithful participate in receiving the same Eucharist.

Priesthood, in all its extension and comprehension, includes something more than power to offer sacrifice. In the act of offering sacrifice, the priest appears before God as the representative of the people, exercising an office of mediation in their behalf. He is also the representative of God before the people, exercising on behalf of God an office of mediation. The generic character of priesthood is mediation and intervention between God and man in respect to all things which belong to sanctification and salvation. Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man in one Person, is the Mediator reconciling humanity to God. The prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices are included in the general office of mediation. He reveals the truth, He accomplishes the redemption, He guides, directs, and governs the Church of the adopted sons of God, in fulfilment of His mission as the Christ, the Anointed, making His humanity the channel of all the gifts of grace of which in His divine nature He is the author and source. All this is expressed in the titles given Him by St. Paul, "Apostle and High Priest." The same mission which He received from the Father, the apostolate and the pontificate, He communicated to His chosen Apostles. In their hands He left the New Testament, the legacy bequeathed in dying to His heirs, the faithful in all time; the Sacrament of the Eucharist, with all the other sacraments; the faith and law of the Christian religion; the ministry of grace and reconciliation; teaching authority and governing power. The mission was perpetual, and implied the power and command to provide for a succession to all the apostolic office except that part of it which was of its own nature transient because completely and once for all accomplished by the foundation of the Church and the original promulgation of the New Law.

In the second century it was the universal tradition in the Church that the succession to the apostolate was in the Catholic episcopate; in the bishops, who were priests, teachers, judges, and rulers, possessed of plenary authority, in one organized, corporate body under the Roman Church and Bishop as its head. This was the Catholicism of A. D. 200.

The testimony of St. Cyprian proves this abundantly. It is convenient to cite from his works, because he wrote more copiously and explicitly on the very points at issue than earlier writers had done, particularly as to certain general aspects of that early Christianity. He was born and flourished in the period immediately succeeding the epoch of St. Irenæus, St. Victor, and Tertullian, but his testimony reaches back to that epoch, for there are no traces of any change having taken place, much less of any innovation in doctrine or polity introduced by him. He was educated in the Catholicism of the second century, and all his energies were ex-

erted to preserve and defend the ancient Catholic tradition against every kind of schismatical and heretical aggression. His episcopate, which began two years after his conversion, lasted only ten years, which were spent in laboring for the defence of the Church of Carthage and the Church of Rome against pagan persecution and the treason of internal enemies. He had no time and no inclination for speculative theorizing, and if he had indulged in any vain ambition to new-mould Christianity, he would have lacked the power and the means to influence the Church at large. Even in that one contention which he had with Rome and the general body of the Church outside of his own and one or two other provinces, he was not consciously and intentionally an innovator. He rested on the authority of his predecessors, and followed a local and partial, which he mistook for an ancient and Catholic, tradition. And in this struggle his party was worsted, and in the end forced to submit to the judgment pronounced from the first by Pope Stephen. Moreover, all the statements of St. Cyprian, which are so clear and undisputed in matter of dogma and polity, are supported by previous authorities running back through the second and first centuries to the time of St. John the Apostle, so that he is an authorized spokesman for that entire period. There is no more conspicuous or noble personage in that glorious age than St. Cyprian, whether in respect to his high rank as the prelate next in dignity in western Christendom to the Roman Pontiff, his ability and energy as a ruler and teacher, his magnanimity and intrepidity of conduct and exalted Christian virtue, or his fortitude as a confessor and martyr of the Catholic faith. His whole career,—short, yet crowded with events and achievements enough to fill up a long life,—and his most precious works, present a brilliant picture and exhibition of the genuine Catholic Christianity of that early period which he adorned. He is a witness who could not have been deceived, and who was too sincere and holy to be a deceiver in the momentous matter of religion.

In his person and office, St. Cyprian is a living witness to the hierarchical organization in strict corporate unity of the Church of his period. He was not only Bishop of Carthage, but Primate of all Africa Minor, including six ecclesiastical provinces, over each of which the senior bishop presided as Primus. He writes to Pope Cornelius:

"Since our province is very widely extended, and has also Numidia and the two Mauritanias joined to it, . . . it was our pleasure that letters should be written (which was also done) to all holding positions in those regions, so that all our colleagues should firmly adhere to you and to your communion, that is, to the unity and charity of the Catholic Church" (Ep. xlv., *ad Cornelium*).

One brief sentence from another letter sufficiently expresses this doctrine of the unity of the Church under episcopal regimen, which St. Cyprian abundantly and emphatically teaches throughout all his writings.

"There is one Church divided by Christ through the whole world into many members, and there is also one episcopate diffused through the whole number of many bishops united in concord" (Ep. lii., *ad Anton.*).

Again he writes :

"The blessed Apostle Paul shows forth the sacrament of unity, saying : ' There is one body and one spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God.' Which unity we bishops who preside in the Church are specially bound to keep with firmness and to vindicate, that we may make manifest that the episcopate also is one and undivided. . . . There is one episcopate, a part in which is held by its single members in solidarity" (De Unit. Eccl.).

St. Cyprian frequently and explicitly deduces the authority of bishops from apostolic institution and succession to the Apostles.

"Deacons ought to remember that the Lord chose Apostles, *i.e.*, bishops and prelates ; but after the ascension of the Lord into Heaven, the Apostles constituted deacons for themselves as ministers of their episcopate and of the Church. Wherefore, if we can venture to oppose God who makes bishops, deacons may venture to oppose us by whom they are made" (Ep. lxx., *ad Rogat.*).

"We labor and are bound to labor especially for this, that we may secure, as far as in us lies, that unity which was imparted by the Lord and through the Apostles to us their successors" (Ep. xlii., *ad Cornel.*).

So also Firmilian :

"The power of remitting sins was given to the Apostles, to the churches which they, being sent by Christ, established, and to the bishops who have succeeded to them by a vicarious ordination. But the enemies of the one Catholic Church in which we are, and the adversaries of us who have succeeded to the Apostles, vindicating for themselves against us unlawful priesthoods, and erecting profane altars ; what else are they than Korah, Dathan, and Abiron?" (*Firmilian to Cyprian*).

This last citation from the Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a predecessor of St. Basil, strengthens the force of the testimonies of St. Cyprian, showing conclusively that his doctrine was not an invention of his own, but the common tradition of the eastern as well as the western Christendom.

Harnack sums up the doctrine of St. Cyprian on the unity of the Church in the apostolic episcopate, as follows :

"According to Cyprian, the Catholic Church, to which all the lofty biblical prophecies and declarations are applicable, is the *one* saving dispensation out of which there is no salvation, and moreover it is such, not only as the communion of the genuine apostolic faith in the sense that this is an exhaustive definition expressing the entire concept of the Church, but she is such as a confederation subsisting in organic unity. This church rests, therefore, entirely and solely upon the episcopate which, as the continuation of the apostolic office and armed with all the power of the Apostles, is its support" (*op. cit.*, pp. 345-346).

St. Cyprian's concept of the Church as strictly bound together in organic unity, and of the episcopate as one, is totally diverse from the notion of a mere alliance among a great number of independent bishops, each one ruling over a distinct church; which is mere congregationalism. The organic unity of the Catholic episcopate supposes and requires a constitution and order in the hierarchy to which single bishops are subject, an authority to which they are amenable. As unity in a local church is effected by the subordination of all its clergy and laity to one legitimate bishop, so the unity of the bishops and their churches in a territory, and of all the bishops and churches in the world, must be effected by a more extensive application of episcopal authority and jurisdiction, proportioned to the extension of the united parts, and, in respect to the whole extension of the Church, *universal* and *supreme*. In point of fact, from the earliest period of which we have a distinct account in history, the bishoprics grouped themselves around metropolitan sees having a lesser or greater pre-eminence as their bishops presided over provinces, exarchates, or patriarchates, the three Petrine sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch taking precedence of all, and Rome possessing the universal primacy; it being, as Harnack expresses it, "a recognized fact that the Roman congregation held the presidency among the circle of sister congregations" (p. 410).

St. Cyprian held the position of primate of Africa from his predecessors in the See of Carthage. This see was itself subordinate to the Roman See, by reason of its dignity as the patriarchal see of the west, to say nothing of its universal primacy. We have already seen the admission of Lightfoot that Pope Victor "held the *Metropolitan See of Latin Christendom*." The entire history of St. Cyprian's administration manifests a constant correspondence with Rome, even while during an interregnum the see was administered by Roman presbyters. In these relations, the admitted superiority of Rome over Carthage is manifest. And the same superiority over the churches of Gaul is recognized in the letter which St. Cyprian wrote to Pope Stephen, requesting him to listen

to the petition of Faustinus of Lyons and other bishops, in behalf of which his own aid had been invoked, that Marcian of Arles, a partisan of Novatian, might be deposed and another substituted in his place (Ep. lxvii., *ad Stephan*).

The pre-eminence of metropolitan sees and primates, being evidently and by universal consent of purely ecclesiastical institution, could not possibly give the requisite solidity to the grand structure of Catholic unity, founded on the unity of the episcopate. The subordination of bishops, all equal in respect to their ordination, under the metropolitan regimen, would have been lacking in a sufficient principle of right and obligation, if it had not had a centre and source of apostolic and divine authority in a supreme, universal episcopate confided to the hands of a successor to St. Peter's principality and located in one Supreme, Apostolic See. As the unity of single churches had its key-stone in the bishop who was a representative and Vicar of Christ by apostolic and divine appointment, so the unity of the universal church required a key-stone in the primate of the Catholic episcopate, the Vicar of Christ in the government of the whole Church. On the same principle which demanded that because there is one God, one Christ, one Faith, there should be one bishop in each local church, it was necessary that there should be in the Catholic Church one Bishop of whom all bishops were colleagues ; and thus a solidarity of the episcopate was founded, instead of a mere alliance of independent bishops and churches. In the supreme pastoral charge over the whole body of the clergy and faithful committed by Christ to St. Peter, and bequeathed by St. Peter to his successors in the Roman See, the bishops as successors to the colleagues of St. Peter in the apostolate shared with their chief episcopal dignity and power. In the presidency over the collective episcopate, a delegated, subordinate pre-eminence was shared by the several grades of archbishops, from the metropolitans of provinces to the patriarchs. Thus the actual organization of the Church made practically possible and reduced to real existence the grand ideal of one flock, in one fold, under one shepherd, preserving Catholic unity even when the bishops were numbered by thousands, the clergy by hundreds of thousands, and the faithful by tens of millions.

St. Cyprian, who is surpassed by none in his firm grasp of the idea of Catholic unity and the strong bond of this unity in the Catholic episcopate, does not fail to see and to present to view the key-stone of this arch of unity in the Roman Church, where is the chair of Peter, and the succession of the heirs of his primacy :

"The sentence that the Church is 'founded upon Peter,' " says Dr. Harnack (p. 348, note 2), "Cyprian has very often expressed."

"Peter also, to whom the Lord commits his sheep to be fed and guarded, upon whom he established and founded His Church," etc. (De Hab. Virg.).

"There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair founded by the word of the Lord upon Peter (Ep. xl, *ad plebem*).

"Peter, upon whom the Church had been built by the same Lord, speaking once for all, and answering in the voice of the Church, says Lord, to whom shall we go?" (Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).

"There is one Church, founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter, in respect to the origin and rule of its unity, *origine unitatis et ratione*" (Ep. lxxx., *ad Januar.*).

"He builds the Church upon one, and although, after His resurrection He gives equal power to all the Apostles, nevertheless, in order that He might manifest unity, He disposed by His own authority the origin of that same unity as beginning from one" (*De Unit.*).

"The Lord gave that power first to Peter, upon whom He built the Church, and from this source He established and exhibited the origin of unity" (Ep. lxxiii.).

St. Cyprian constantly recognizes the Roman Church as the See of Peter, and the bishop sitting in the Chair of Peter as his successor in the primacy. In a letter of apology addressed to Pope Cornelius he writes:

"We know, that in giving instruction to all those who were going on a voyage, that they should not make their voyage with any scandal, we exhorted them to acknowledge and hold fast to the *root and matrix of the Catholic Church.*"

He then goes on to speak of the letters sent to the bishops throughout his extensive province concerning the canonical election of Cornelius:

"In order that all our colleagues may firmly acknowledge and hold *your communion, that is the unity and likewise the charity of the Catholic Church*" (Ep. xlv.).

"Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God and His Christ, . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter and the dignity of the sacerdotal chair, was vacant, . . . when the tyrant (Decius) would hear with more patience and equanimity that a rival prince arose against him than that a rival priest was constituted at Rome" (Ep. lii.).

"After these things they dare, moreover, having a pseudo-bishop instituted for them by heretics, to set sail and carry letters from profane schismatics to the chair of Peter and *the principal Church whence sacerdotal unity took its rise*, not reflecting that those to whom they went were Romans (whose faith is proclaimed as worthy

of praise by the Apostle) *to whom perfidy cannot have access*" (Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).

The resistance of Cyprian and Firmilian to the decree of Pope Stephen respecting the baptism of heretics, and the language used by these prelates on that occasion, are cited as evidences that they did not recognize the Papal supremacy. A calm and careful consideration of the whole case shows, however, that the two great bishops of Carthage and Cæsarea, with their colleagues who acted with them, did not oppose the primacy in principle, but only what they regarded as an abuse of authority in respect to a matter which they held to be merely disciplinary, and not pertaining to Catholic dogma. The utterances of St. Cyprian, when he was in the heat of this controversy, have not the same value with those of a former period; and, in so far as the two classes of texts are in contradiction with each other, the latter ones ought to be disregarded. Harnack says on this head:

"Cyprian has, undoubtedly, in his conflict with Stephen, put himself in contradiction with his earlier views on the importance of the Roman See for the Church; views which, however, he had put forth in a critical period, when he stood shoulder to shoulder with the Roman bishop" (*Lib. cit.*, p. 349).

Apart from St. Cyprian's doctrine respecting the primacy of St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See, and the historical evidence furnished by his whole career in the episcopate to the supremacy of Rome over Carthage, the very conflict between Cyprian and Stephen shows in the clearest light the primacy which was *claimed* and *exercised* at that time by the Pope.

Having fully proved that St. Cyprian teaches the continuance of the apostolic office by succession in the Catholic episcopate, and pre-eminently in the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, it remains to show that he regarded this office as in the strict and proper sense sacerdotal.

The writings of St. Cyprian are so pervaded by the sacerdotal idea that it seems superfluous to cite particular passages. Indeed, it is admitted by all that he held and taught most explicitly that Christ established a priesthood in the Church, conferred by ordination and possessed in all its fulness by bishops, with whom presbyters share the gift in an inferior degree.

It will be enough to cite a passage from Harnack:

"The definitive conclusion of the old-Catholic Church idea, as it completed itself in the second half of the third century, is, perhaps, most distinctively exhibited in the quality of *priesthood* which was acquired by the clergy, and which gave to it the highest importance. . . . Its significance is shown by the use made of it in Cyprian and the first six books of the "Apostolical Constitutions."

The bishops (respectively also the Presbyters) are priests, inasmuch as they alone are empowered to offer the sacrifice *as representatives of the congregation before God*, and inasmuch as they, *as representatives of God before the congregation*, impart or refuse the divine grace. In this sense, they are also judges in God's stead. . . . The divine grace already appears as a sacramental consecration of an objective kind, whose communication is reserved to *spiritual* persons chosen by God. . . . The 'serving at the altar and celebrating of divine sacrifices' (Cypr. ep., 67) is the distinctive function of the priest of God; but beyond this, *all* rites of worship belong exclusively to him, and, moreover, Cyprian understood how to derive the ecclesiastical government of the bishop from the priestly office; for, as priest, the bishop is *antistes Christi* (dei), and herein is the right and duty founded to guard the *lex evangelica* and *traditio dominica*. As *antistes dei*, which the bishop becomes through the apostolic succession and the laying on of hands, he has also received the power of the keys, and therewith the right to impart or withhold the divine grace. In Cyprian's concept of the episcopal office, the apostolic succession and the position of representative of Christ (*i.e.*, of God) balance each other; also, Cyprian sought to blend together these two elements (Ep. 55, '*Cathedra Sacerdotalis*')."

One passage from St. Cyprian will suffice as a specimen of the manner in which he always sets forth priesthood as the chief and distinctive character of the episcopal office even at its summit in the person and chair of the successor of St. Peter. In a letter to Pope Lucius, the immediate successor of St. Cornelius, written on the occasion of his return to Rome from exile, St. Cyprian writes:

"We have lately congratulated you, most dear brother, when the divine condescension conferred upon you a double honor in the administration of His Church, as equally a confessor and a priest; and now we congratulate you and your companions and the whole brotherhood no less that the benign and abundant protection of the Lord has brought you back again with the same glory amid the praises of all to your own; so that the pastor should return to the feeding of his flock, the captain to the command of his ship, and the ruler to the government of his people; and it is made manifest that your exile was so divinely disposed, not that the bishop should by his exile be driven away and separated from his church, but that he should return to the church with an increase of power. . . . A sudden persecution having lately broken out, the secular power all at once assaulted the Church of Christ, and the Bishop Cornelius, that blessed martyr, and all of you, in order that the Lord might show for the confusion and overthrow of

heretics which is the Church, who is its one bishop chosen by the divine ordination, who are the presbyters joined in sacerdotal honor with the bishop, which is the united and true people of Christ" (Ep. lviii., *ad Lucium Papam*).

It is the principal and distinctive office of the priest to offer sacrifice. Therefore, in the writings of St. Cyprian, the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ offered upon the altar as the Sacrifice of the New Law and given to the faithful in communion, is continually placed in apposition with the doctrine of the Christian priesthood.

In a letter written to one Cæcilius, St. Cyprian condemns an abuse which had crept in, among some ill-instructed Christians, of sometimes celebrating the Eucharist with pure water instead of wine mixed with a little water. He says:

"Since some, either by ignorance or simplicity, in sanctifying the cup of the Lord and ministering to the people do not do that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the founder and teacher of this sacrifice, did and taught, I have thought it as well a religious as a necessary thing to write to you this letter. . . .

"In the priest Melchisedech we see prefigured the Sacrament of the Sacrifice of the Lord. . . . And that Melchisedech was a type of Christ the Holy Spirit declares in the Psalms, saying (from the person of the Father to the Son): 'Before the morning star I begat thee; thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech'; which order is surely this, coming from that sacrifice and thence descending, that Melchisedech was a priest of the Most High God; that he offered bread and wine; that he blessed Abraham. For who is more a priest of the Most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered that very same thing which Melchisedech offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His Body and Blood? . . . If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered" (Ep. lxxv., *ad Cæcil.*).

"When, therefore, He says that whoever shall eat of His bread shall live forever, as it is manifest that those who partake of His Body and receive the Eucharist by the rite of communion are living, so on the other hand we must fear and pray lest any one, who being withheld from communion is separate from Christ's body, should remain at a distance from salvation; as He Himself threatens and says: 'Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye shall have no life in you.' And therefore

we ask that our bread—that is Christ—may be given to us daily, that we who abide and live in Christ may not depart from His sanctification and body" (*De Orat. Dom.*).

There remains only one more prerogative of the episcopate to be noticed, viz., that it is the depository of the apostolic tradition of the faith, and therefore by its teaching is the proximate rule of faith to all the members of the Church.

St. Cyprian's doctrine of the unity of the Church, as the one and only institute of salvation built upon the episcopate as its foundation, necessarily implies the infallible doctrinal magistracy of the episcopate. Schism is separation from the communion of lawful bishops, heresy is a departure from their dogmatic teaching. It is necessary to be obedient to their teaching authority and their ruling power in order to be united with the Church and with Christ. Separation from this communion entails a forfeiture of grace and salvation. The greater part of St. Cyprian's writings are a polemic against schismatics and heretics; and therefore the necessity of communion with the one true Church is everywhere emphasized and insisted upon in the most explicit manner. His teaching is most distinctly and decisively *Catholic* in the sense that all the gifts and graces of God have been confided to the Church, and from her are to be received, through sacerdotal and sacramental ministrations, by individual believers. This is the significance of the apostolic succession in the doctrine of St. Cyprian. The Apostles committed to chosen men, their successors, the plenitude of the sacerdotal gifts and powers which they had received from Christ, the Chief Apostle and Pontiff, by immediate divine authority and mission from the Father.

The character of priesthood consists specifically in the power to consecrate and offer the Holy Eucharist, the sacrifice of the New Law. This power was communicated to presbyters also, as well as bishops, who were therefore associated with bishops in the proper dignity and office of the priesthood. The superiority of bishops over presbyters in respect to the priestly office was derived from their distinct and higher consecration, giving them the plenitude of the priesthood, the most complete and perfect sacramental grace conveyed by ordination and transmitted by an unbroken succession of bishops from the Apostles. This plenitude of priesthood and of the sacramental grace of order consists, specifically, in that full power over the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist by which they can not only consecrate and offer, but also preserve and perpetuate in the Church this heavenly gift by transmitting the priesthood to bishops and presbyters ordained by their hands. They are the fathers in the sacerdotal order, in which presbyters are their sons. As all other priestly powers and offices spring out

of the specific character of the priesthood which is a consecration to the office of offering sacrifice, pre-eminence and superiority in all these powers and offices belong naturally to those who possess the plenitude of the priesthood. They succeed to the fulness of ordinary apostolic power as pastors, rulers, custodians of the faith and sacraments, teachers and judges of Catholic doctrine, colleagues of the head and chief of the episcopate, the successor to St. Peter's supreme apostolic primacy. The bishop is the priest by pre-eminence and in the most excellent sense, and in this is rooted the essential necessity of the episcopate for the being as well as for the well-being of the Church. It is necessary because the bishop is created not merely by a legitimate election and appointment, but by a distinct, sacramental ordination, which a presbyter must receive from a bishop in order to become a bishop, and because no ordination to the priesthood is valid except episcopal ordination. The validity of all sacramental acts which depend on the sacerdotal character of the minister, and, specifically, the validity of the consecration of the Eucharist, the greatest of all the sacraments, depends on the transmission of sacerdotal power from Christ through the Apostles and their successors.

There is, therefore, a heaven-wide difference between the Catholic doctrine of the episcopate and any kind of Protestant conception which leaves out the character of priesthood in the Christian ministry. An episcopal constitution of church polity in which the clergy are mere elders and overseers over whom a superintendent presides, whether this polity is regarded as established by the Apostles or as a development from congregational and presbyterian elements, lacks the backbone and marrow of Catholic hierarchy. It is easy to show the excellence and advantages of episcopal polity, and that no other can so well unite single communities of Christians into large confederations, especially such as transcend national boundaries. Many Protestants have recognized this truth, not only among adherents of the episcopal church of England and its offshoots, but among members of other sects. For instance, that very enlightened and religious monarch, Frederick William IV., of Prussia, ardently desired to have all the Protestant sects united in one communion under episcopal regimen. But if this union were attainable, and were actually brought to pass, it would not produce a Catholic, Apostolic Church. A genuine sacerdotal order and the apostolic succession are wanting in Protestantism. Even in those oriental communions where a valid episcopal succession has been preserved, the sacrament of unity has been broken, and a truly Catholic episcopate does not exist; consequently, they make no part of the Catholic Church but are mere sects, schismatical aggregations of fragments broken off from the grand edifice of Catholicism.

This grand, hierarchical edifice, this Catholic Church, built on the foundation of an episcopate established by the Apostles with the fullness of sacerdotal gifts and powers, appears in the writings of St. Cyprian as an already universal, world-wide institution, as the traditional, genuine, orthodox Christianity, in opposition to all heretical and schismatical pseudo-Christian counterfeits.

This is a conclusive proof that Christianity was identical with Catholicism in the year 200. Cyprian was no innovator. He received the tradition of his predecessors, such as it was in his childhood and before his birth. There is no sign of any difference in dogma, in the essentials of the liturgical and sacramental rites, or in the principles and substantial forms of ecclesiastical organization among different parts of the Church, nor of any alteration which took place during the third century. The Christianity of the third century was inherited whole and entire from the second century, and was handed on to the next age, when it bloomed forth in all its splendor in A. D. 313 and 325, the epoch of Constantine and the First Council of Nicaea.

To return now to the second century. The evidence which has been adduced from the first half of the third century has served to cast a light backward upon the second, and to make the testimonies which it furnishes to the hierarchical constitution of the Church more intelligible. Our immediate purpose is to go backward from the point of departure taken in the beginning, viz., the year 200, through the second into the first, in order to prove the apostolic origin of the Catholic hierarchy.

The universal establishment of episcopacy, and the pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome, in the second century, have been already shown in the first part of this article; and the concessions of high Protestant authorities have been quoted. I will add one more citation from Neander to the same effect:

"Very early, indeed, do we observe in the Roman bishops traces of the assumption that to them, as successors of St. Peter, belonged a paramount authority in ecclesiastical discipline; that the *cathedra Petri*, as the source of apostolic tradition, must take precedence of all other *cathedræ apostolicæ*. . . . In the Montanist writings of Tertullian we find indications that the Roman bishops already issued peremptory edicts on ecclesiastical matters, endeavored to make themselves considered as the bishops of bishops—*episcopus episcoporum*—and were in the habit of speaking of the authority of their '*antecessores*'" ("Hist. of the Church," Bohn's Ed., i., 296).

We have already seen what Protestant authors say of Pope Victor, and they say similar things of Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus. The heresies and sects of that early period were more dangerous to Christianity than the persecutions. The heresies which sought to

undermine and destroy the fundamental articles of the creed, the Trinity and the Incarnation—the sects of Gnostics, Marcionites, Novatians and Montanists—were extensive, active, aggressive and formidable. It was chiefly the authority and power of the Popes, aided by the Catholic bishops, which prevented them from destroying Christianity and suppressed them in the course of time, as Neander admits. Harnack endeavors to prove, in the most elaborate manner, that the canon of Scripture, the establishment of the dogmatic creed, the consolidation of the hierarchical organization of the Church, the total and complete Catholicism which triumphed in the beginning of the fourth century and became historical Christianity, were the product of the struggle with these sects. He is entirely wrong in his conception of Catholicism as a substitution of a new religion in place of the primitive Christianity. But he is right so far as this: that it developed its principles, its doctrines and its discipline; that it grew and strengthened itself; that it manifested its real nature and became consolidated, by means of the conflict with heresy and sectarianism. Hence the bitterness with which Tertullian, when he had lapsed into Montanism, assailed the hierarchy, and especially the Roman See. And it is precisely by these bitter and sarcastic attacks of his on the Roman pontiffs that he has furnished such striking evidence of the power which they claimed and exercised, and to which the Catholic Church submitted.

But Tertullian, in his orthodox writings, has laid down the principles by which his own conduct as a sectarian, and all the positions taken by other heretics and schismatics, are most unequivocally condemned. It is well known how highly St. Cyprian esteemed, and how assiduously he studied these admirable treatises of the orthodox Tertullian. His life extended from A. D. 150 the probable date of his birth, to A. D. 220 the probable date of his death. He is a witness to the genuine Catholic Christianity of the whole of the second century, as this was universally believed to have been received from the Apostles. In his treatise "On Prescription against Heretics," it is his object to establish a rule of apostolic and orthodox doctrine against all heresies whatsoever. He testifies distinctly and explicitly to the fact that the Catholic Church existed in unity of profession throughout the world, and he makes this unity a test of the truth.

"Is it likely that so many churches, and they so great, should have gone astray into one and the same faith? No casualty distributed among men issues in one and the same result. Error of doctrine in the churches must necessarily have produced various issues. When, however, that which is deposited among many is found to be one and the same, it is not the result of error but of

tradition. . . . Let them then produce the original records of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, coming down in due succession from the beginning in such a manner that their first distinguished bishop shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles or apostolic men, a man, moreover, who continued steadfast with the Apostles. For this is the manner in which the apostolic churches transmit their registers; as the Church of Smyrna, which records that Polycarp was placed therein by John; as also the Church of Rome, which makes Clement to have been ordained in like manner by Peter. In exactly the same way, the other churches likewise exhibit those whom, as having been appointed to their episcopal places by Apostles, they regard as transmitters of the apostolic seed. . . . Come now, you who would indulge a better curiosity, if you would apply it to the business of your salvation, run over the apostolic churches in which the very chairs of the Apostles are still pre-eminent in their places. . . . Achaia is very near you, in which you find Corinth. Since you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. Since you are able to cross to Asia, you get Ephesus. If thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence also we have authority. That Church how happy! into which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord; where Paul is crowned with an end like the Baptist's."

St. Irenæus is a witness to doctrine and discipline in the Catholic Church, not only during the period of from one-half to two-thirds of the second century in which he lived, but also during the first third of the same century, and the last decennium of the first in which his teachers had been bred up in the Christian faith by apostolic men. He was born of Christian parents in Asia Minor, somewhere between the years 115 and 140, was educated in Smyrna, and was the pupil of St. Polycarp, Papias, and other venerable presbyters of that early time. His testimony goes back through St. Polycarp and other disciples of the Apostles to the period of St. John, and is therefore of the highest value and authority in respect to apostolic Christianity. Moreover, he is a witness in respect both to the east and to the west. Trained up in Asia Minor, he visited and resided for years at Rome, made himself acquainted with the traditions of other churches, and became finally Bishop of Lyons, where he was crowned with martyrdom about A. D. 202. What remains to us of the writings of St. Irenæus in a Latin version suffices to furnish a very distinct and, in respect to the most important matters, a quite complete account of the Christian doctrine and order of the first half of the second century, as it was received from the first and handed down

to the third. He was principally engaged in confuting heretics, and setting forth in opposition to them the Catholic principles of genuine, apostolical Christianity. His expositions and arguments have a striking similarity with those of Bossuet and other great Catholic polemical writers against the modern Protestant sects.

St. Irenæus was the great Catholic doctor of his age, in respect to both profane and sacred learning, superiority of intellect and power of reasoning, purity of doctrine, the apostolic spirit, and the high Christian virtues of a confessor and martyr of the faith. The entire Church of his period speaks by his mouth, and the age which followed gave its unanimous sanction and approbation to all his teaching. His works are the best and purest source of information respecting that Christianity which was Catholic and orthodox in the age immediately succeeding the apostolic. And, although we have to regret the loss of some of his works, and of the original Greek text of the greater part of those which are extant in a Latin version, what we have is amply sufficient to give a clear and complete idea of his entire system.

In the first place he testifies to the Catholic unity of faith and organization existing in that Church which was in communion with the great sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Carthage, and other political and ecclesiastical centres throughout and beyond the geographical limits of the Roman Empire.

"The Church, although dispersed through the whole world even to the extreme limits of the earth, has the faith which was received from the Apostles and their disciples, which is in one God," etc. . . . "and this faith and doctrine, received, I say, as we have before affirmed, the Church, although dispersed through the whole world, as if it inhabited one dwelling-place, preserves with the highest zeal and carefulness, and, as having one soul, and one and the same heart, to all these nations equally accommodates the faith, and with an admirable consent, as if having but one mouth, preaches, teaches, and hands down these doctrines. For, although there is great diversity among the languages of the world, the efficacy of tradition is one and the same everywhere. Hence, those churches which are situated in the German regions do not have another belief or tradition; nor do those which have their seat in Spanish or Gallic regions, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Africa, or in the Mediterranean parts of the globe. But as the sun constructed by God is one and the same in the universal world, so also the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men who desire to come to the knowledge of the truth" (Con. Hæres., 2 i., c. 10).

"We ought not to be still seeking among others the truth, which

is easily received from the Church ; since the Apostles have most fully placed in it, as in a depository of treasure, all those things which pertain to the truth, so that every one who wishes can take from it the water of life. For this (the Church) is the entrance of life, whereas all others are thieves and robbers. Wherefore it is a duty on the one hand to avoid these, and on the other, with supreme diligence, to seek for and appropriate those things which are of the Church, that is, the tradition of truth. What now ought to be done? Even if there is a discussion concerning some lesser question, we should have recourse to the most ancient churches in which the Apostles were conversant, and to receive from them what is certain and actually clear in respect to the question in hand. And even if the Apostles had not left to us the Scriptures, would it not be a duty to follow the order of the tradition which they delivered to those to whom they committed the care of the churches? To this ordinance many nations of barbarians assent, that is, of those who believe in Christ, having the saving doctrine written in their hearts by the Spirit without parchment or ink, and diligently keeping the ancient tradition" (iii., c. 4).

In another passage St. Irenæus still more clearly teaches that the apostolic tradition was committed to the bishops with a teaching magistracy which continued the inspired, infallible teaching originally delivered by the Apostles as the rule of Christian and Catholic faith. And not only does he explicitly declare this infallible magistracy of the Catholic episcopate in general, but also the pre-eminence in the episcopate of the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter.

"Therefore, the tradition of the Apostles manifested in the whole world can be seen in every Church by all who wish to discover what the true doctrines are; and we can enumerate those who were instituted bishops in the churches by the Apostles and their successors, even to our own time, who have never known or taught anything like the madness which is vented by these persons. And certainly, if the Apostles had known recondite mysteries which they taught the perfect separately and concealed from the rest of their disciples, they would with most special care have entrusted them to those men to whom they committed the churches; for they desired that these should be very perfect and irreprehensible in all things whom they left after them as their own successors, delivering over to them their own place of magistracy; from whose exemplary conduct great advantage would ensue, whereas their lapse from rectitude would be the cause of the utmost calamity. But since it would take too long to enumerate in a book like the present one the succession of all the churches, by merely exhibiting the tradition of that greatest and most ancient (*i.e.*, pre-eminent

in dignity) Church, which is known to all, founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome,—the tradition of faith received from the Apostles and proclaimed to all men, and which has come down even to us by the successions of the bishops,—we bring to confusion all those who assemble in unauthorized meetings at their own pleasure for the sake of vain glory, or because they are blinded and misled by false opinions. For with this Church, on account of her more powerful principality (pre-eminence, headship, authority, supremacy), it is necessary that every Church, that is the faithful everywhere dispersed, should agree, in which (in communion with which) Church has always been preserved by the faithful dispersed that tradition which is from the Apostles. The blessed Apostles, having founded and instructed the Church, handed down the episcopate of the administration of the Church to Linus . . . and now Elutherius holds the episcopate in the twelfth place from the Apostles. By this same order, and by this same succession, both that tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is a most full demonstration that it is one and the same life-giving faith which is preserved in the Church from the Apostles and handed down in truth" (iii., sec. 3).

"The heavenly gift (of faith) has been confided to the Church as a principle of life for all her members . . . In her is accomplished all that operation of the Holy Spirit, in which they have no part, who, instead of being in communion with the Church, exclude themselves from life by their bad doctrines and criminal conduct. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and with her all grace" (iii., sec. 24).

Protestant writers have made very singular work in their attempts to elude the force of the declarations of St. Irenæus, which are so fatal to their cause. On the one hand they have made very singular concessions, and on the other very singular efforts to minimize and turn aside the clear and incisive statements which seem like an anticipated polemic against modern heresies. As an instance of Protestant concession, I quote Ziegler, who (in his work "Irenæus Bischof von Lyon," Berlin, 1871), says:

"To the mind of Irenæus it is the episcopate which sanctions the rule of faith, not *vice versa*. With him, as with Cyprian, the highest ecclesiastical office is inseparable from orthodox doctrine. . . . He makes the preservation of tradition, and the presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church, dependent upon the bishops, who in legitimate succession represent the Apostles, and . . . this manifestly because he wants at any price to have a guarantee for

the unity of the visible Church. This striving after unity appears in the most striking way in that passage where *he passes as if, in a prophetic spirit, beyond himself, and anticipates the Papal Church of the future.*"

No! he does not anticipate but describes the Papal Church as a present reality from St. Peter to St. Elutherius.

St. Irenæus is not a theorizer, an innovator. He is not an isolated teacher, setting forth a private, personal doctrine. He is the spokesman of the whole Church, in East and West; of his own time, the interpreter of tradition, the representative of St. Polycarp and St. John the Apostle, of the Christianity of the immediate disciples and successors of the Apostles. This is what Protestants have to face: The fact of the unanimous consent of the widely diffused Church of the beginning of the second century, in the Catholic tradition as having been received from the Apostles.

There is no way for Protestants to escape the dilemma, and remain Protestants, but to fall back on pure rationalism and give up altogether the Gospel which some of them hold so dear and cling to so tenaciously. Abandon these early witnesses to Catholicism, and reject their tradition of the Church, and you have lost at the same time the principal evidence of the Gospel, and all that which those who call themselves evangelical and orthodox Protestants regard as the very essence of the religion of Christ.

Dr. Fisher, one of the brightest ornaments of Yale University, and not surpassed by any Protestant scholar in this country, refers to St. Irenæus as an unimpeachable witness to the authenticity of the Gospel of St. John.

"Irenæus, a man of unquestioned probity, bishop of Lyons in the latter part of the second century, by whom, as by all his contemporaries, the fourth Gospel was received without doubt or question, had personally known in the East the martyr Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and had heard him describe the manners and appearance of the Apostle John, whom Polycarp had personally known at Ephesus where the Apostle spent his closing years. It is morally impossible that Irenæus received a Gospel as from John which Polycarp knew nothing of, or that Polycarp could have been mistaken in a point like this." (Art. "The Christian Religion," *N. A. Review*, February, 1882.)

Exactly for the same reason, Irenæus and his contemporaries could not have been mistaken about the whole ecclesiastical tradition of the hierarchy, the Roman primacy, the entire system of Catholic doctrine and discipline universally received as apostolic in the second century.

Dr. Fisher, in the same article just quoted, says: "Christianity existed and was complete, and it was preached, before a syllable

of the New Testament was written." What this complete Christianity, everywhere preached, really was, we know with certainty from the testimony of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian; to which might be added many other testimonies from various parts of the Church. The creed is a part of this tradition, and the New Testament is a part of it, though the entire canon did not receive full sanction until a later period, and the value of this sanction depends entirely on the infallible authority of the Church, which is antecedent to all dogmatic teaching, and underlies the whole fabric of Christian doctrine.

This infallible authority lodged in the Catholic episcopate as the continuation of the apostolate, is sufficiently established by the testimony of St. Irenæus. The bishops universally claim to be the successors of the Apostles in their sacerdotal teaching, governing, and judicial office, and this claim is unquestioned in the Catholic Church; is resisted only by heretics and schismatics, who made separate sects, all of which melted away and perished from the face of Christendom.

The testimony of St. Irenæus is corroborated by that of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and martyr. He was born near the time of the closing scenes of the life of our Lord, lived through the apostolic age, was a disciple of St. John and St. Peter, and was constituted by apostolic authority Bishop of Antioch, succeeding St. Evodius, who was the immediate successor of St. Peter in that see. He was martyred at Rome under Trajan, A. D. 107 or 116. He is, therefore, a most competent authority in regard to the constitution of the Church in the first century, and to all the ordinances of the Apostles. His epistles, written during his journey as a prisoner from Antioch to Rome, are full of testimonies to the episcopal constitution of the Christian hierarchy. He writes to the Ephesians:

"The bishops, constituted throughout the regions of the earth, are in the mind of Christ. Whence it becomes you to agree to the mind of the bishop, which you indeed do. For your honorable presbytery, worthy of God, is joined to the bishop as the strings to a harp."

To the Trallians:

"Let all likewise reverence the deacons as the commandment of Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the senate of God and the council of the Apostles. Without these, no assembly is called a Church."

These two passages prove the universality of the triple constitution of the Christian hierarchy as constituted by apostolic and divine authority, against all pretexts of variety in the order of different churches, and of a growth of episcopacy from an earlier Presbyterian order. To the Philadelphians:

"As many as are of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop. . . . Therefore, be heedful to frequent one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice in the oneness of His blood, and one altar, as there is one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons.

When St. Ignatius writes to the Romans, there is a marked difference in his tone and language, which manifests the deep reverence with which he regarded the Roman Church, as holding the place of supreme pre-eminence among all the churches of Christendom.

"Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the Church which has obtained mercy in the magnificence of the Most High Father and of Jesus Christ His only Son; the Church beloved and enlightened by the will of Him who wills all things, which are according to the love of Jesus Christ our God, which also presides in the place of the region of the Romans. . . . presiding over the love (*i.e.*, the universal Church united by the bond of love), bearing the name of Christ and the Father."

Thus the second century gives its testimony to the organic unity of the Catholic Church founded on its episcopal hierarchy. This testimony goes back into the first century, and to the Apostles St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John, the founders of the churches of Rome, Antioch, Ephesus, and Smyrna, through their immediate disciples St. Polycarp and St. Ignatius, from whom St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian receive and hand over to the succeeding age the pure apostolic tradition.

There is but one way by which Protestants seek to evade the conclusion that the hierarchical order of the Catholic Church was established by the Apostles under the direction of Jesus Christ. Its existence in the second century is a fact which must be accounted for. What was its origin if it were not of apostolic institution? It is assumed that it was a development, an evolution, or a transformation, which was silently effected during the obscure period which elapsed between the end of the apostolic ministry of St. Peter, St. Paul, and the other Apostles with the exception of St. John, and the age of St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus. Those who call themselves orthodox and evangelical Christians, and who therefore have an ideal of a certain positive, primitive Christian religion of which their Reformed Christianity is a reproduction, look upon the original Christian Church as a collection of single congregations under the presidency of one or more elders, holding fellowship with one another. These elders or presbyters, where in larger congregations they were associate pastors, naturally gave an honorary precedence to one of their number as their presiding elder. Thus in the clergy there were pastors or rectors,

who either stood alone as chiefs of smaller congregations, or who had associate ministers united with them in a sort of presbytery. These chief or presiding presbyters, gradually gaining a greater pre-eminence over the others, became the bishops of the second century. Likewise, the fellowship of churches grew into a stricter and more formal confederation, which in the process of time developed into diocesan, provincial and more general complexes, all embraced in one œcumenical society or Catholic Church. The fundamental ideas of this plan are, the essential independence of distinct churches, and the essential equality of all ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Subordination of churches and of pastors, ecclesiastical order and organization, according to this scheme, have a voluntary origin, are ecclesiastical arrangements established by purely human authority.

The evidence of the episcopal constitution of the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Asia Minor, in the first century, is sought to be evaded by the plea of a varied and unequal process of transition from presbyterian to episcopal government in different parts of the Church universal. This is purely theoretical, and rests only on negative arguments which take advantage of the scanty records, and the ambiguous terms used to designate the offices of the Christian ministry, in the period preceding that in which St. Ignatius and St. Irenæus flourished. The beginnings of Christianity were of course like those of all great buildings. The foundations were laid by missionaries, who did a preparatory work by converting, baptizing, and gathering together their disciples under such provisional and inchoate conditions as were immediately necessary and possible. The transition from a missionary to a regular and complete organization of the Church, from a provisional to a permanent government under local pastors, the formation of dioceses or parishes, of provinces and patriarchates, the determination of what may be called the elementary canon law, was necessarily a work of time. The ecclesiastical terminology became settled by degrees in the same way, not by formal enactments but by usage. The disciples of the Apostles were first called Christians at Antioch, and the name became imperceptibly common and universal. So with the term Catholic Church, and the names of bishop and presbyter in a distinctive sense; so too with the terms sacrament, Trinity, and many other dogmatic, ritual, or disciplinary formulæ expressive of sacred things in the new religion, which became consecrated by usage. This is as much as to say that there was a development in the distinct, formal expression of the dogmas of faith, in the ecclesiastical organization, in the terminology which fixed the names of new things brought into existence by Christianity. The obscurity which

hangs over the earliest stage of this development of Christianity from its beginnings, on account of the scarcity of historical documents, furnishes the opportunity for ecclesiastical Darwinism to sport its hypothesis of the evolution of the historical Christianity of the second century from a different specific form in the first, and from a primitive protoplasm like that which Strauss, Renan and Harnack have imagined its original germ to have been.

In the instance of the episcopate, which we have made the pivot of our whole discussion, the evangelical Protestants who make it a transformation of Presbyterian regimen start from their own idea of the Christian Church and ministry. A church is a mere congregation of individual Christians. A pastor is the presiding officer and teacher of this congregation, most properly called an elder. If he has one or more associates, he is a chief elder, or they are equal colleagues. The theory is that in the first century churches, having several presbyters as colleagues, came to be under the special oversight of one presiding officer in the presbytery and the congregation. The division of an original parish into several, and the colonizing of country congregations from cities and towns, gave rise to dioceses over which the pastor of the mother church retained a superintendence, and among these dioceses the oldest or otherwise most important had a certain honorary precedence, as did also their bishops. In this theory the differential note of episcopacy is the diocesan, as distinguished from the parochial organization. A bishop is superior to a presbyter only as the president of several distinct congregations with their local pastors. There is no intrinsic difference between the bishop and the presbyter, or between the minister and the layman. The office is one of external appointment only, and ordination merely a decent ceremony, like installation, inthronization, or any other form of testifying the legality of the appointment to office, having no sacramental efficiency and conferring no supernatural grace and power on the recipient. Even on this low view of the Church and the ministry, the hypothesis of a universal, rapid, and quiet change from a loose organization of churches under mere elders, all equal in office, to a strict and complex polity and a subordination of clergy and laity to the authority of a monarchical episcopate, would have been morally impossible.

But, in point of fact, there is much more involved than a mere matter of external organization. In the question of the origin and development of the Catholic episcopate, the process of the formation of dioceses and provinces, and the determination of the precise relations between bishops and presbyters in their administrative functions, is not the main and essential point. The great underlying basis of the Catholic doctrine of apostolic succession

in the episcopate is the idea of the unity and sacramental character of the Church as the fountain of sacramental grace, from which, through special sacraments having an operative efficacy, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are communicated to individual members of the Church. This sacramental unity, by its organic type and principles, demands a true priesthood endowed with supernatural powers in the Church, and a hierarchical order which secures its unity and perpetuity. The episcopate of the second century claimed, with the unanimous consent of the faithful, to have received from the Apostles a true pontificate, the fulness of sacerdotal dignity and power, in which the presbyters had a secondary share. This is the pivot on which the whole discussion turns. The essential point is, that the Apostles received a true priesthood from the High Priest, Jesus Christ, which they had authority and commandment from Him to transmit to their successors. The nature of this sacerdotal office has been already explained, and also that of the pontifical office or the high priesthood, which is exclusively confined to bishops. It is evident that the priestly character, being sacramental and giving power over the real Body of Christ, as well as over His mystical body, can only be conferred by an authority received from Jesus Christ through the Apostles. The universal tradition in the Church from the beginning ascribes this authority, not to mere presbyters, but to a superior order of bishops, who have received a separate and higher consecration. Herein is the idea and the necessity of apostolic succession, viz., that the Apostles committed the custody of the faith and the sacraments, the transmission of the priesthood, the power of the keys, and the office of ruling and judging to the Catholic episcopate. We have seen that the great writers of the second century had no conception of any other form of Christianity but this, and that all Christians recognized it as apostolic, Gnostics, Marcionites, Montanists, and other heretics only excepted. The hypothesis of a change from a presbyterian to an episcopal order involves, therefore, the notion of a radical alteration in the whole idea of the Christian Church and ministry, and of the Christian religion in many doctrinal and practical respects. This radical alteration must also, if the aforesaid hypothesis is logically and consistently carried out, be made to include all the fundamental articles of the distinctively Christian creed. There is no middle ground between the position of Catholics and that of pure rationalists. M. Renan may be taken as the spokesman of rationalists, in respect to the supposed change from primitive Christianity to Catholicism, in the first century and a half of the existence of the religion of Christ and the Apostles. In his "*Marc Aurèle*," he thus sums up the results of his historical criticism :

"We may say that the organization of the churches experienced five degrees of progress, four of which were passed over during the period included in the present work. First, the primitive *ecclesia*, in which all its members are equally inspired by the Spirit. Then the ancients, or *presbyteri*, assume a considerable right of control and absorb the *ecclesia*. Next, the president of the ancients, the *episcopus*, absorbs almost all the powers of the ancients, and, consequently, those of the *ecclesia*. Afterwards, the *episcopi* of the different churches, by a mutual correspondence, form the Catholic Church. Among the *episcopi* there is one, he of Rome, who is evidently destined to a great future. The Pope, the Church of Jesus transformed into a monarchy, with Rome as a capital, appear in the dim distance. . . . At the end of the second century the episcopate is entirely ripe, the papacy exists in germ" (p. 416).

M. Renan attempts to trace also a parallel development, or rather evolution of the most fundamental dogmas of Catholic faith, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the resurrection, etc., which, in the year 180, had reached such a stage of progress, that at this epoch he says :

"The Christian doctrine is already such a compact whole that nothing more can be added henceforth, and that any considerable alteration is no longer possible" (*Ibid.*, p. 507).

The Catholic dogmatic faith is a complete whole ; the Catholic hierarchical organization is a complete whole. The two are indissolubly compacted together in one great whole, in full-orbed Catholicism, apostolic and Roman, at the end of the second century. The sacramental and sacerdotal elements are as closely combined with the other elements of orthodox Christianity as the single substances are combined in a chemical composite. As the subtraction of oxygen or hydrogen from water destroys the substance of water, so the subtraction of one element from Catholic Christianity destroys its essence.

When, how and by whom was the combination made? We find it existing at the end, in the middle, at the beginning of the second century ; at the end of the first century, with the sanction of the Apostle St. John. The hypothesis of a change during the time which elapsed between the close of the apostolical ministry of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the close of the ministry of St. John, cannot be restricted to the limit of a mere external polity. The hierarchical polity is indissolubly connected with the essential principles of the sacramental and sacerdotal constitution of the Church, of the rule of faith, of Catholic unity, dogmatic and organic. Either the entire Catholicism came from the Apostles as the ministering agents and instruments of Christ, or there is no authentic canon of the New Testament, no authentic preaching of the divinity of Christ,

no supernatural Christian religion at all. This is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

The foundation and triumph of historical Christianity is a phenomenon without a parallel in the history of the world. It demands a cause, and an adequate cause. That it should have sprung up suddenly out of the ground, without any root in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, leaving no trace of its beginnings and progress within thirty or fifty years from A. D. 70, and have become complete within another thirty or fifty years, is incredible and inconceivable. Such a hypothesis is like the foolish fancy that the universe came into being by chance. The only reasonable cause which can be assigned is the divine wisdom and power of Jesus Christ, who founded the Catholic Church and gave instructions and the Holy Spirit to the Apostles; who continued His work and provided for its extension and perpetuity in the institution of the episcopate centred and consolidated in the primacy of the successors of St. Peter. This Church of Christ, one, holy, Catholic and apostolic, is its own proof. Its existence proves its divine origin, and itself is the most brilliant and conclusive proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

[NOTE.—In the foregoing article the date A. D. 200, assigned to various events, is not to be taken as precisely accurate, but as standing for the closing period of the second century ending with that year. Many additional proofs of Catholic doctrine and discipline might be cited from the second century and the end of the first, which had to be omitted for want of space. I may be permitted to refer to many articles which I have published in the back volumes of the *Catholic World*, in which several topics of the present article are more fully treated and discussed.—A. F. H.]

THE ANGLICAN THEORY OF CONTINUITY.

THE Church of England is the most important of the Protestant sects. As a religion, it has very little influence; but as a State-made institution of one of the great political powers, it counts for something in most of the nations of the earth. We need therefore make no apology for the discussion of a theory which has found favor with the High Church party in Great Britain and which is the very back-bone of the contention of the Ritualists: "The Continuity of Catholicity in the Church of England."

The theory may be briefly stated in this way. The Ritualists having approached as nearly to the Catholic Church as they could manage to do without submitting to her authority, have been driven into this corner, that they have had to substitute a past authority for an authority which is living and which is present. This past authority is, or was, the early Church; and the Ritualists affirm that they are in agreement with this past authority, and are therefore in communion with the Catholic Church. In other words, the Church in England, during the first few centuries, being assumed by Ritualists to have been *not* Roman Catholic; and the Church of England in this present day being *not* Roman Catholic, it must follow, argue the Ritualists, that the Church of England and the early Church must be necessarily one and the same Catholic Church. This theory is called the theory of continuity, or the theory of the continuousness of the early Church. It will be observed that Roman Catholics, in England, are on this theory, schismatics and heretics; they are indeed, as it were, simply Protestants; the Archbishop of Canterbury being the true Supreme Pontiff, and Pope Leo XIII., an intruder.

Now, to vindicate their theory it will be necessary for the Ritualists to establish the three following facts: that (1) the government; (2) the doctrines; and (3) the ritual of the Church in England, during the earlier or pre-middle age period, were identical with (1) the government; (2) the doctrines, and (3) the ritual of the Church of England as by law established at this present day.

More than this, the Ritualists must prove that the English religion of the Middle Ages was identical with the post-Reformation religion; for, that the religion of the Middle Ages should be one religion, and the post-Reformation religion another religion, would be a breach in continuity which would be fatal to the theory that "there has been no breach in the English Catholic religion." This

last point is quite as important as are the other three points. If it can be shown that the Catholic religion in England, from, say the sixth to the sixteenth century (one thousand years) was *not* identical with the religion of the Ritualists—not identical in government, in doctrine, in ritual,—then away goes the theory of continuity; because a chasm of a thousand years would have to be leaped over, in order to reach across to the Catholic Church of the early centuries. No man would gravely argue that continuity could mean a rupture of fully one thousand years in Catholic communion, any more than he could gravely argue that a gold watch guard, of which ten out of nineteen links had been broken away, was one continuous gold watch guard of nineteen links. And if the strength of a chain be the strength of its weakest link, the strength of a chain of which ten links were wanting—and these ten links lost from the middle of the chain—would be the strength of, say, no chain at all.

We first take up the assumption that the early Church in England was identical in government, in doctrine, in ritual, with the Church of England of the year 1892.

I.

As to the government of the early Church we assert that it was identical with the government of the Catholic Church in the present day, the Bishop of Rome being the recognized Pontiff, so that all bishops received their jurisdiction from him. Will not Dr. Döllinger be accepted by our Anglican friends as a good authority in such a matter of history? In his volume on "The First Age of Christianity and the Church," when commenting on the divine origin of the Primacy, he says, "Christ gave to Peter four closely allied promises of future power and pre-eminence in the Church: (1) he should be the rock whereon Christ should build it; (2) the Church built on him should never fail; (3) Christ would give him the keys of His kingdom or Church; (4) what he bound or loosed on earth should be bound or loosed in heaven." And in his "History of the Church," Dr. Döllinger says: "That the decrees of synods concerning faith obtained their full force and authority only by being received and confirmed by the Pope, was publicly acknowledged in the fourth century." He adds, in regard to the early general councils: "The Fifth General Council held in 381, which was a council of only Oriental bishops, acquired the authority of an Œcumenical Council by the subsequent acceptance and confirmation of the Pope, St. Augustine declaring after the two African synods had been confirmed by the Pontiff, '*Roma locuta est, causa finita est!*'" So again the Council of Ephesus, in forming its judgment against Nestorius, said that it did so follow-

ing the canons and the epistle of the Pope. The same council also ratified, without any further examination the Papal condemnation of Pelagianism. At Chalcedon the council in drawing up its dictum on the point of the controversy, did not appeal to the synod which had been held at Constantinople, under Flavian, but only to the decree of the Pontiff. In the judgment upon Eutyches, Cecropius, Bishop of Sabaste, declared in the name of all his brethren, that the Bishop of Rome had sent to them a formulary, and that they all followed him and subscribed to his epistle. The Sixth General Council in like manner declared that it adhered to the dogmatic epistle of the Pope Agatho, and by it condemned the heresy." And then, adds Dr. Döllinger, as a commentary on the fact that the whole of the early Church throughout the world was Roman Catholic: "It was acknowledged to be the prerogative of the first see in the Christian world that the Bishop of Rome could be judged by no man. It was a thing unheard of that the head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church."

But perhaps Anglicans will reply that Dr. Döllinger was a German; he could not enter into the spirit of "Theophilus Anglicanus" Besides, a few years after writing his "History," Dr. Döllinger discovered that all his readings of history had been wrong, and he acted in a manner which he had affirmed in his "History" was "a thing unheard of in the early Church." Moreover, the Ritualists are fond of arguing in this way: "Britain was independent of Rome in the earlier times, whatever may have been the case with other countries. It was not till the Mission of Augustine that the Pope obtained any power over Britain." Now we have to affirm in reply, that there were Roman Catholics in England before the date of what is called the "Augustine Mission." We have to remember that England was imperially a Roman colony, long before it became ecclesiastically Roman Catholic. The whole of England was dotted with Roman towns; richly sprinkled with the works of Roman engineers; a Roman census and a Roman poll tax were levied; and, what is more to the point, Roman Christians filled places in the army, and also in some departments of the State before the time when Pope Eleutherius, in the second century, sent missionaries to the Catholic Christians then in England; missionaries who spoke the Roman tongue to the Roman Christians, who were then numerous, though scattered, throughout Britain; missionaries who, by the authority of the Holy See, firmly planted their own authority in England; so that, a little later, the English Bishops who were present at the Council of Arles (and this too in the early part of

fourth century) had Roman names and were Bishops of Roman towns: Prestitutus, Bishop of London, Adelphinus, Bishop of a colony of London, and Eborius, Bishop of York, the Roman Capital. Before the time of the Council of Nice, all these Bishops, in common with Bishops of Gaul, Spain, Italy, and Africa, had signed a synodal letter to Pope St. Sylvester, submitting to him certain disciplinary decisions. Long before the Roman imperial forces left Britain, bishops of Roman blood and Roman name had been sent to the Picts and the Irish by the Roman pontiffs (such names as Patricius and Palladius speak for themselves). And the very titles, clerical and Catholic, still in use in the Church of England, prove how solely Roman was their origin: Archbishop, precentor, canon, parson, chancellor; as also such words as Sacrament, cathedral, Testament, Bible, telling the tale of Roman origin and Catholic paternity. As the *Guardian* newspaper (that most respectable of Church of England organs) said on February 8, 1889: "It cannot be said too often the Roman planted, the Scot watered, the Briton did nothing. Mind, it is no kind of blame to the Briton that he did nothing, but as a matter of fact he did nothing. The Scot did a good deal, but he did nothing till the Roman had begun, and his work may be looked on as merged in that of the Roman. Make what theological inferences we choose . . . the Church of England is, above all other Churches of Europe, the child of the Church of Rome." It seems probable that it was to the Apostle St. Peter that Britain owed her primitive Christianity; and, if this were so, the Church government in Britain would be absolutely and exclusively Roman Catholic. How precise is that statement in the ancient Syriac documents, discovered by the late Dr. Cureton in the Nitrian monastery in Lower Egypt, and now kept in the British Museum: "The City of Rome, and all Italy, and Spain, and Britain, and Gaul, received the Apostle's Hand of Priesthood from Simon Cephas, who went up from Antioch." This Syriac witness assures us that, at some time between A.D. 42-67, a disciple of St. Peter tried to evangelize Britain. It is true that there was little harvest from that first sowing; yet from the fact that Pope Eleutherius, in the second century, received a letter from Lucius, King of Britain, asking that "he might be made a Christian by his orders," we can infer that there was an early, incipient Catholic Church. Venerable Bede tells this incident of King Lucius, not once but many times in his history; it is found also in the Book of Llandaff, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in the Martyrology of St. Ado of Vienne, and was universally accepted by all authorities. Gildas, the historian, who believes that Christianity began to make its appearance in Britain before the year A.D. 61, is also of opinion that it

did not make much progress till the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 303. Venerable Bede, however, asserts that the Britons, having received the Faith, kept it whole and undefiled, and in peace and quiet till the time of Diocletian the Emperor." And certainly the statement of St. Irenæus (A.D. 178) that "The whole Church has one and the same faith throughout the whole world," must mean that a unity which was impossible without headship was preserved by obedience to God's Vicar. In so brief a space as this single article may afford us, we must rather argue inferentially than historically. And of the inferential class of arguments, there is no safer rule than this: that an effect must be always derived from sufficient cause. Now an "effect" which the earliest writers always insisted on—which saints and doctors always asserted to be manifest—was the oneness of the whole Christian, Catholic family; and this oneness could only be secured by a common government; by one and the same divine, infallible authority. In the earliest centuries we find such testimonies as the following to the fact and to the obligation of Catholic oneness. St. Cyprian, about A.D. 250, spoke of "the Church which is Catholic and one, which is not rent nor divided." St. Cyril, about A.D. 347, advised travellers to "ask for the Catholic Church; for this is the peculiar name of this holy body, the mother of us all." St. Pacian called the Church "everywhere one"; and St. Hilary, "one, not by a confusion of bodies." St. Augustine, about A.D. 390, said "we are joined to the churches beyond the seas"; and St. Irenæus, A.D. 178, as before quoted, affirmed, "the whole Church has one and the same faith throughout the whole world." Now it is evident that such a unity would have been a natural impossibility—just as it is now seen to be a natural impossibility—save on the hypothesis of one common, divine government. The unity of the Visible Body came from its union with the Visible Head. The fact of a universal accord in matters of faith, which was equally testified to and enjoined by the early saints, necessarily involved one common, supreme authority, just as, conversely, we see Protestantism necessarily shivered into countless sects, because its only authority is that of individual, private judgment; in other words, it has no authority at all.

We may trace this divine unity of church government in the Catholic doctrine of the very earliest Christian times, almost as well as we can trace it in the historic proofs of personal rule, or in the exhortations to oneness by primitive saints. What are doctrines, but spiritual certainties for the human intellect, deriving their whole security from infallibility? Now the doctrines of the Church of England of the present day—or, for that matter, of the Church of England of the last three centuries—are no more like

the doctrines of the early English Church, than the pious vagaries of the Salvation Army are like the theology of an old-fashioned rector of some Anglican country parish of fifty years ago. The first sham pontiff of the English Church, Henry VIII., in his book on the Seven Sacraments (five of which sacraments his daughter Elizabeth obliterated) was careful to inform the heresiarch, Luther, that "the Church in England had from the first centuries believed all Roman doctrine"; and he added, "it cannot be denied that the whole church of the faithful recognizes the Holy Roman See as its mother and chief." Sir Thomas More, whom Henry VIII. put to death for insisting on this very same Catholic truth, was only one of a great army of witnesses to the whole Catholic faith of the English people. And at this point it may be observed that it is a favorite delusion of modern Anglicans, that they, and they alone, know what was the faith of the English people, and that the pre-reformation Catholics were misinformed. Yet we may suppose that a man like Sir Thomas More, a learned chancellor, an accomplished scholar, and a saint, was not likely to have offered his head to Henry's spite, unless he knew that the Papal supremacy was of faith. And so too we may express the conviction that the Council of Trent (1546) was at least as good a judge of what was "primitive Christianity," what was the faith once delivered to the saints, as a crowd of hungry courtiers or worldly apostates, who did not know their own minds for two days together, and were continually reviling each other's creeds. It may be taken for granted that More and Fisher, who died for their religion, knew better what was early English Christianity than the Ritualistic clergy of 1892. They knew, for example—just to hint at a few facts—that the Anglo-Saxon believed in the Mass and Transubstantiation; said Masses for the dead, and sang hymns to our Blessed Lady; placed the relics of the martyrs under their altars, and a crucifix above them; and enjoined celibacy on their sacrificing priests. They knew that the British customs, like the British faith, had from the first, been grounded on the teaching of the Holy See; that in the fourth century, British bishops wrote to Pope St. Sylvester, to ask for a confirmation of synodal acts; British bishops being also present at the Council of Arles, which council confessed to the pope's headship; while to the Council of Sardica a synodal letter was despatched, and letters to Pope St. Julius I., in which were the words, "It will be seen the best, and by far the most suitable arrangement, that the priests of the Lord, from every single province, report to the Head, that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter." They knew that on the Feast of St. Peter's Chair, a Mass Collect was said in early times, beginning with, "O God, who on this day didst give us Blessed Peter, Head of the Church after Thyself."

They knew that appeals had been made to Rome, from the earliest times, on points of faith, discipline, jurisdiction; that the pallium had been always the symbol of the pope's supremacy, and that without it no archbishop had jurisdiction; they knew (for these were the words of Bishop Fisher) that "the Church *alone* which has descended from Peter, has obtained the name of Catholic." They knew that the teaching of the English universities had, from the first, been always submissive to the Holy See; that every archbishop had always promised on his knees before the altar, to be "faithful and obedient to the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, and my Lord Pope"; and that even the constitutional law of England had laid it down that "To the pope and the priesthood belong spiritual things; to the king and the kingdom those that are temporal." And, if it be answered by the Ritualists, "But you do not here show that all doctrines were identical in England and in Rome; you speak rather of submission to papal government than of the adoption of the Roman faith and practice"; the answer is that to submit to papal government, and to cling faithfully to Roman faith and practice, were *necessarily* one and the same thing. For, though it be difficult for a modern Anglican to comprehend it, the Catholic faith, which rests on obedience in unity, is necessarily and essentially one in dogma; cannot be diverse, nor in the faintest degree opinionative, because it is the infused truth of the intellect of the Most High. To this subject we will refer again as we go on; suffice it for the answer to say that the doctrines of the Catholic Church were the assured certainties of the teachings of infallibility; so that to admit the infallible decisions of the Holy See is to admit and to know all Catholic truth; to be one in obedience and in belief. And since that admission, that obedience, was common to all Catholics of all ages, it necessarily follows that the early Church was one with the present Church in all matters of faith, reverence, devotion.

As was the first government, the first creed, so was the first ritual of the Catholic Church. The Roman liturgy used in England for nine hundred years, brought by Augustine from Pope Gregory the First, indicates, beyond the possibility of question, the nature of the service in which it is used; determines its character to be sacrificial, and proves that before the time of St. Augustine the ritual of the Church must have been Roman Catholic. St. Augustine offered up the Holy Mass in England, not in the English language, but in the Latin language; he invoked the saints, he venerated the cross, he wore the Catholic robes, he did all and he taught all that was Roman, and as it continues to be Roman to the present day. Now it suffices to say that the Christianity of the early centuries must have been faithfully graven on

that liturgy which St. Gregory used; for to suppose that the Popes within four or five hundred years, had so completely changed and "corrupted" Christianity as to render it no longer St. Peter's religion, is to suppose an absurdity which, in the natural order, would be monstrous, and in the supernatural order an impossibility. Let us keep to the one fact. The Roman liturgy in the time of St. Augustine (and as it came to be used in the Catholic Church in England) was from end to end what Protestants would call "rank popery." This is all we want. If in so very short a time the living Church of the living God, under the special guidance of the successors of St. Peter, could have fallen into abominable idolatry, then there can be no Church at all, and Christianity is all as human as was the authority of Queen Elizabeth, or as is the authority of the present English Privy Council. We shall see the force of this truth as we go on. For the moment let us say that the ritual of the first centuries, like the doctrines, and like the government of the first centuries, was no more like the ritual of the Church of England, than light is like darkness, or substance is like shadow, or the youth of vigorous life is like death. Continuity in the Church of England is about as tenable a theory as the derivation of chaos from creation.

II.

There is no need to speak of continuity through the Middle Ages; the Church of England has kindly settled that question for us. "The Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," says the Thirty-first Article of the Anglican Church. So also we are informed on the same authority that five out of the seven Christian sacraments have "grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles." Extreme unction, we know, has disappeared altogether out of the teaching of the institution which is declared "continuous." Penance has been never mentioned for three centuries, except to be either ridiculed or reviled; Orders have been divested of every symbol of the ancient Ordinals (the anointing the hands with the consecrated chrism; the delivery of the chalice and paten to the newly ordained; the celebration, conjointly with the consecrating prelate, of the Adorable Sacrifice), so as to obliterate the idea of priesthood from the Church of England; and finally, as though to annihilate continuity, by one diabolical sweep of all Catholicism—the Anglican homily on "Peril of Idolatry" affirms that "for the space of eight hundred years and more" (which would be from about the seventh century to the sixteenth) "laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages,

sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom were drowned in abominable idolatry." Here we have not even a loophole left for continuity. The whole of the Middle Ages was Roman Catholic, and Roman Catholicism was abominable idolatry. So that either the Church of England has no more continuity from the Middle Ages than it has continuity from the religion of the Shah of Persia; or else it has the same religion as that of the Middle Ages; in which case it is abominable idolatry.

But we all know the shifts by which it is sought to be established that two obviously opposite principles may be identical. One of these shifts with our Angelical friends is to affirm that the papal power was "a growth of the ambition of the Roman pontiffs; the Church in England in the earlier centuries being independent of Rome, and even resenting all pontifical interference." Now, there is nothing like the testimony of an adversary. We have already quoted Dr. Döllinger as affirming that it was "a thing unheard of in the earlier centuries that the Head of the Church should be judged by his own subjects; he who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not in the Catholic Church"; and we have, too, referred to the testimony of Henry VIII., in his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, addressed to Luther. This last production is so exceedingly valuable as a publication intended to be read by all Christendom, that we may venture to quote it once more. The king's reasoning in regard to "the growth of the ambition of the Roman pontiffs" is perhaps as plain an answer to the Anglican delusion as was ever penned by any Catholic in any country. He says: "If the Pope has obtained this wide and greatly extended power neither by the command of God nor the will of man, but has seized it by force, I fain would know of Luther when he rushed into so great a territory? The origin of such immense power cannot be obscure, especially if it began in the memory of man. But should he say that it is not older than one or two centuries, let him point out the fact from histories; otherwise, if it be so ancient that the origin of so great a power is obliterated, let him know that it is allowed by the laws that he whose right ascends so far beyond the memory of man that its origin cannot be traced, had a lawful beginning; and that it is forbidden by the consent of all nations to move those things which have been for a long time unmoved." And continuing in the same vein of common sense, Henry VIII. says: "When Luther so impudently asserts, and this against his former declaration, that the Pope has no kind of power over the Catholic Church; no, not so much as human, but that he has by sheer force usurped the sovereignty, I greatly wonder how he should expect his readers to be either so credulous or so dull as to believe that a priest without any weapon

or company to defend him (as doubtless he was before he became possessed of that which Luther says he has usurped) could ever have hoped to gain, without any right or title, such empire over so many bishops, his equals, in so many different and distant nations; or that all people should believe that all kingdoms, cities and provinces had been so reckless of their own affairs, rights and liberties as to give to a strange priest an amount of power over them, such as he could not have dared to hope for." This puts the case very sensibly; and when Henry VIII. was made "Defender of the Faith" for so really creditable a defence of Catholic truth, he reached the summit of his respectability as man and king; and it is a pity that he did not then die and make an end of it. Subsequently, however, the charms of Anne Boleyn got the better of Henry's sense and good morals, so that the only "continuity" of the Catholic faith which he has left to "the Church of England by law established" is the empty title of "Defender of the Faith"; not defender of the Catholic faith, but of that curious muddle of Protestant negations which Queen Victoria swore at her coronation to uphold. Continuity is perhaps in no way better illustrated than in this inheritance of words without their sense. While on this subject we are reminded of a kindred example of continuity in the instance of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who charges his shield with the *Roman Pallium*, the symbol of Rome-conferred jurisdiction; thus acknowledging that jurisdiction comes from the Pope, while pleading guilty to not having got it. We are reminded, too, of the continuity of the word Catholic, as now claimed by the Ritualist party in the Church of England; a claim, in regard to which Mr. Labouchere recently remarked in *Truth*: "The Roman Catholic Church was known as the Catholic Church for many centuries. It has, therefore, the right to this 'trade-mark.' What people call themselves matters little; the important point is, what they are. For the Church of England to call itself the Catholic Church has always seemed to me as absurd as for the Hartington and Chamberlain gang of seceders to call themselves the Liberal Party." And once more, we are reminded of the continuity of sees, cathedrals, parish churches, names of saints, prayers, collects, gospels, epistles, and a countless array of what we must frankly call "stolen goods"; all testifying to the truth that England was Roman Catholic, and that "Roman" and "Catholic" meant the same thing. Continuity in all these cases is really the appropriating others' property and breaking it up so as to try to prevent identification; the very process of breaking it up proving, first, that it belonged to others, and next, that those others believed all Roman doctrine.

Appropriation by force is not continuity. When Henry VIII.

applied to Parliament (not to Convocation) to declare him virtually supreme head of the Church in England, in the spiritual as well as the temporal sense of headship, the bill was passed by a small majority under a reign of terror; numerous Catholics, including the saintly Fisher and the heroic and ever to be honored Sir Thomas More, suffering death rather than give their sanction to such impiety. As Macaulay says: "When the supremacy was transferred to King Henry VIII., of pious memory, and all things which by the canon law belonged to the Roman pontiff as Head of the Church were made over to him, he then became king and pope." But no sooner was this frightful sacrilege accomplished—this almost impossible mockery of divine truth and natural sense—than Henry VIII. passed by force the Statute of the Six Articles, declaring transubstantiation, communion under one kind, celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, the Sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead, and auricular confession to be included within the obligation of the English religion. Now, two things are most important to be here observed: first, that Henry VIII. dared not repudiate even one of these Six Articles, because he knew that all Christendom had always held them; and next, that the subsequent repudiation of those Six Articles by Queen Elizabeth cut off all continuity with the Catholic Church. The action of Henry VIII. in repudiating *only* the papal supremacy proved that he did this *only* because he wanted to marry Anne Boleyn; while the subsequent action of his daughter, Elizabeth, in instituting her terrible penal laws, and in cutting off all continuity with the Catholic Church, proves that she knew she could only reign by absolutely uprooting that divine religion, whose Visible Head had pronounced her to be illegitimate. Henry VIII.'s rebellion had been only schismatical; his heresy was an after-thought, if a prolific one; Elizabeth's rebellion was the forcing the whole nation into apostasy as the only means of securing her place upon the throne. As Macaulay says in his essays: "The chief actors in the Reform movement regarded the whole thing as a mere political job." Dr. Lee, the Anglican writer, says: "The queen did not in the least believe, though officially she was bound to do so, in her so-called supremacy. . . . She frankly avowed to Lausac, the French envoy, that circumstances" (meaning her illegitimacy) "had created a breach with the Pope, and that the English Parliament and people having resolved to make a *new* Church for themselves, she was obliged to assume and exercise the office of supreme governess of it." So far, however, had been the English people and the English Parliament from "resolving to make a new Church for themselves," that it was only by the queen's threats that Parliament had been compelled (and this, too, by a majority of three only) to pass the Act of Uniformity in apostasy.

And it was only by the institution of the most savage penal laws—quite as savage as the laws of the pagan emperors, but more continuous in their exercise or execution—that Catholic England was compelled to appear Protestant, while all the while loathing the new religion. Fines, imprisonment, banishment and hanging were the apostolic arguments of Queen Elizabeth while converting the nation from the old religion of fifteen centuries to a mixed Lutheranism, Calvinism and Zwinglism. Fearful became the penalties for saying Mass, and for *not* substituting the communion service, mocked as “May Game”; fearful became the penalties for *not* pulling down the old altars, so as to emphasize the extinction of the old priesthood, and for *not* substituting what the people called an “oyster table,” from which to administer Queen Elizabeth’s new sacrament. So that at one and the same time Catholic government was annihilated, Catholic doctrines were ridiculed or blasphemed, and the whole body of Catholic law, discipline and custom was removed out of the towns and parishes of England. Catholicity was wiped out with continuity. As to Christian unity, that went, of course, with Christian doctrine. As Archbishop Heath, the primate, said, in the House of Lords, when uniformity was being debated and resisted: “By relinquishing and forsaking the See of Rome, we must forsake and flee from these four things: (1) all General Councils; (2) all canonical and ecclesiastical laws of the Church of Christ; (3) the judgment of all other Christian princes; (4) and we must forsake and flee from the unity of the Christian Church; and by leaping out of Peter’s ship, hazard ourselves to be overwhelmed and drowned in the waters of schisms, sects and divisions.” Still, a majority of three passed uniformity, and Elizabethanism took the place of Catholicity.

Thus much might suffice for our present purpose, which is to dispose of the whole question of continuity. Our Anglican friends try to forget that the bishops imprisoned by Queen Elizabeth were still the only *Ecclesia Docens* in England; they alone retained the right of jurisdiction; and the mock bishops who took their places had no more authority than had Queen Elizabeth to teach, rule, command, or administer sacraments. These mock bishops, with one exception, were all Calvinists, opposed to everything that savored of Catholic episcopacy, and ridiculing “the Popish idea of Apostolic Succession.” Parker wrote to the Chief Secretary, Cecil, to ask “whether her Majesty *and you* will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered”; and, in order to provide against the inconvenience of having no true bishops, the Queen caused an act to be passed by parliament that, “the Queen shall collate or appoint bishops in bishoprics being vacant; and that, without rites or ceremonies”; that is without

episcopal consecration. No wonder that "Anglican Orders cannot be proved." In the first place, all the Catholic bishops holding office at the time refused to hand over the succession to Elizabeth's shams, so that no canonical succession was even possible; while, as for jurisdiction, that was hopelessly gone forever; and without jurisdiction where is authority? It was all very well to take four unfrocked, degraded friars, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, and tell them to consecrate a Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, "supplying all defects" by the supreme royal authority of Queen Elizabeth; but as Barlow was never a bishop, except by election; as there is no record of his having been consecrated; as he did not believe in the necessity of consecration, but thought the royal appointment quite sufficient; and as the form, moreover, used in consecrating Parker, was insufficient for the making of a bishop, we can dismiss Barlow as a link in the continuity. As to Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, not one of them was a provincial bishop in the sense of the fourth canon of the Council of Nice, and, not having any jurisdiction themselves, they could not confer it upon others; nor had any one of them been consecrated by the English Church, but only by Cranmer's invalid rite. As to Cranmer's ritual, it had been drawn up expressly to do away with priestly orders in the Church of England; the prayer of consecration, with the accompanying imposition of hands, being purposely omitted by its author. Thus, in matter, form, and intention, all such consecrations were invalid; and the continuity of orders in the Church of England has been ridiculed by all schismatical bodies; just as, after critical examination, it was pronounced by Pope Clement XI., in April, 1704, to be so utterly futile and worthless, that "all heretical ministers returning to the bosom of the Church must be treated as lay persons."

Nor did the immediate successors of these sham bishops believe in the validity of their orders. Thus, Whitaker, being reproached for his want of orders, replied, "keep your orders to yourselves"; Fulke, a sort of official Anglican controversialist, spoke of "stinking, greasy, anti-Christian, and execrable Orders"; while Grindal long refused to accept office, through his dislike of "the mummery of consecration." Shortly afterwards, Jewel wrote, "religion is everywhere changed"; and, in his "Apology," he ridiculed, as did Fulke and Whittaker, the notion that "succession" was necessary. So deeply did this Puritan spirit possess these "reformers," that within less than a century episcopacy went out of date, and nonconformism became the fashion of the country. Professedly Catholic, Calvinistic, Presbyterian, and Anglican, the Church of England went all round the compass within a century; nor was it till the reign of James I. that the clergy became so ashamed of

their orders that they "cooked" the Lambeth Register, so as to get rid of the Barlow difficulty; for which offence the king granted a general pardon. We may go so far, indeed, as to say that the present Church of England only came into existence in the year 1662, at which date its formularies were altered into their present shape, and ordained clergymen were requisitioned for the ministry. Nor does the law of England recognize the Establishment as identical with the Church of England; Parliament, in virtue of its *altum dominium*, having alienated every Catholic endowment from the objects for which it was bequeathed, so that, for example, the Catholic Mass cannot be said in the very chapels which were built and endowed for Catholic worship. Finally, Queen Victoria at her coronation had an oath administered to her, by the Primate of her own church, to "maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion, as by law established"; that is, the religion of 1662. The Throne, therefore, like the Parliament, like the Reformers, knows nothing of the religion of old England. Protestantism is the religion of Englishmen. Catholicity has its continuity in the Catholic Church; but the Church of England is no more Catholic than is Wesleyism or Quakerism; indeed in its hostility to the Catholic Church, it has been more schismatical, more Protestant, than any of the numerous sects it has begotten.

III.

We have, thus far, glanced chiefly at two periods: the early Church, and the fifty years of the Reformation. We have necessarily only "glanced," for, in so vast a subject, it is impossible to go critically into any single point which is in dispute. To begin with, the chief inquiry with every Anglican is, "What is the earliest known *kind* of Christianity?" the Anglican idea being that the Catholic Church is as changeful as is any purely human society or institution. They even *wish* it to be so. They instantly take the side which is opposed to Church unity; instinctively throw in their lot with rebellion. Thus, they are determined to prove that, when Augustine came to England, British Christians had already broken Catholic unity; and they feel a keen gratification in trying to show that "independence" was the key-note of early English Christianity. They will have it, that the British refused to keep Easter at the time which was approved by the Holy See; utterly ignoring the fact that the British *had* fixed their Easter, A. D. 453, in accordance with the then custom of Rome; utterly ignoring the fact that, A. D. 326, the Emperor Constantine certified that the same Easter was kept in the city of Rome and through all Italy, Africa, Egypt, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Lybia, and all Achaia"; and utterly ignoring the fact that the long bitterness of warfare between the two

racess, British and Saxon, naturally made the British reluctant to receive an emissary who came fresh from the Saxon headquarters, who asked them to bless and benefit their enemies, and who was the close friend of the Saxon, Ethelbert of Kent. Moreover, the question of Easter was not a question of dogma; it was a question of ecclesiastical uniformity; it was a question which was discussed in East and West for a period of more than two centuries; and when the time for keeping it was finally settled at Rome, no further opposition was attempted. A hundred and forty years before Augustine reached Kent, we find the decisive entry in the "*Annales Cambriæ*": "This year (A. D. 453) Easter is changed on Sunday, with Pope Leo, Bishop of Rome." The Catholic spirit which animated the British in 453 was not likely to have become Protestant in the sixth century.

The point, the one point, for Anglicans to consider, is that, when Augustine and his missionaries came to Canterbury, they found that the Roman Catholic religion had preceded them. They found at Canterbury, for example, an ancient Catholic Church, St. Martin's, and in this Church they "said Mass," as Bede records; they sang, prayed, preached, and baptized, and applied themselves to "frequent watching and fasting." In other words, they did everything that was Roman Catholic, and nothing that was Anglican or Protestant. Pope Gregory, who "bore the pontifical primacy all over the world," as Bede says, created Augustine Primate over all England. He sent Augustine the *pallium*, that is, he conferred upon him jurisdiction; and, writing to Augustine, the Pope said: "We give you no authority over the bishops of Gaul, because the Bishop of Arles received the *pallium* in ancient times from our predecessors; but as for all the bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care." Mark the words, "received the *pallium* in ancient times from our predecessors"; an assertion of long established supremacy which would have been an absurdity had it not been an historic fact. Just as it would have been an absurdity,—to go back to so early a date as only ten years after the martyrdom of St. Alban, and therefore to an early part of the fourth century,—for Eborius, Bishop of York, to sign a letter to Pope St. Sylvester, which letter was addressed to "The Most Beloved Pope Sylvester," and in which letter the various prelates used the words: "Bound together in one common bond of love and the oneness of our Mother, the Catholic Church, we salute thee, most glorious Pope, with the reverence due to thee"; unless all Christendom was then aware, and was duly impressed with the *historic* truth, that the Bishop of Rome was the Holy Father of the Catholic Church, and that, apart from him, there was a lifeless body without a head.

We must, however, go more fully into details so as to grasp the obedience of the whole of the Ages of Faith. We affirm, as the general principle, that the Popes always claimed plenitude of power, and that bishops, kings, and peoples always conceded it. The real history of the conversion of England to the faith began with the mission of St. Augustine; and, within a period of eighty years, by the united aid of Roman and Celtic missionaries, the whole country was gained over to the faith, and the Church of England was solidly built up. Henceforth the kings made all temporal arrangements, but the Pontiffs did the spiritual part. England, like all other countries, looked to the Popes as the foundation of jurisdiction, and also as the supreme judicial tribunal in regard to all ecclesiastical matters. And while this historic fact is indisputable, it is equally indisputable that the Popes regarded themselves as the bulwark of the independence of all bishops, a fact as obvious as that the modern Anglican bishops, and also the bishops of the Czar's Church, are the slaves of the State, of the civic power. It is desirable that we bear such facts in mind when measuring the ecclesiastical power in the Middle Ages. The very mention of such words as Appeals, Investitures, Prohibition, *Præmunire*, Provisos, and the like, recalls to us the constant *necessary* strife that went on between the Church and the world. The frontier-line, which divided the spiritual from the temporal, was *necessarily* always a subject of dispute between the Pontiffs and these worldly, selfish sovereigns. What was the office and the business of the Church except to protect the faith of peoples; to protect their liberties, in the full enjoyment of their religion, against the temporal ambition or mundane greed of this bad secular governor or of that? It is the fashion with Anglicans to talk of "Papal Usurpation," whereas the truth is that the usurpation was always monarchical, the usurpation by kings being both natural and easy, but by Pontiffs as unnatural as it was difficult. The frequent tricks of bad kings to get the better of the Pontiffs led to endless misunderstanding and scandal, and it is only by a close study of contemporary history that we get to see through the network of such controversies.

Brevity obliges us to allude only to a few examples of Papal prerogative, and of royal and episcopal admission of such prerogative. St. Gregory the Great claimed from Spain, France, Illyria, Constantinople, the same obedience which he claimed from Catholic England. "We have sent you the pallium as a gift from Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles," wrote St. Gregory to Leander, Bishop of Seville. To Vergilius, Bishop of Arles, he gave "the vicegerency of the churches belonging to the kingdom of our illustrious son Childebert, according to the *ancient custom*." To Had-

rian, Bishop of Thebes, he wrote: "By the authority of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, we cancel and annul the decrees which you have passed." To a certain monk, Athanasius, in Asia Minor, he gave leave to return to his monastery, to be reinstated in his former position, thus reversing the sentence of the Patriarch. In short, he exercised every kind of authority which appertained to an ecclesiastical ruler. He prescribed synods, received appeals, annulled decrees, deposed bishops, judged of faith, marked out dioceses; and he did it all with language which showed his assurance that all such "plenitude" would be recognized by all the persons to whom he wrote. And at this point the observation may be made, that St. Gregory the Great acted in this manner fully two centuries and a half before the discovery of what are known as the "Forged Decretals." So that *their* influence on Pontifical action was simply *nil*. Only two remarks need be made about the "Forged Decretals." The first is, that the assertion of prerogative which they contained excited no surprise in the mind of Christendom, because such prerogative had been always recognized by all Christians; the second, that the phrases which were borrowed by the clumsy forger were all borrowed from Christian writers of a previous age; showing that, though the Decretals were largely forged, the faith which they embodied was primitive.

To return to England: It would be easy to quote scores of instances in which the kings submitted all spiritual matters to the Popes; as when Edward II. wrote to a Roman Cardinal, "Jesus Christ committed the care of His Church to Blessed Peter the Apostle, and in his person to his successors the Roman Pontiffs, to be ruled by them in succession forever"; and Henry VI. wrote to the Council of Basle, "From the very cradle of the Christian religion his (the Pope's) authority has been regarded as most manifest, and the plenitude of his power revered with all possible veneration." And it would be easy to quote the language of English archbishops, rendering homage to the same acknowledged primary truth; as when St. Anselm wrote, "I will speed me to the Supreme Pastor, the Chief of all, the Angel of Great Council"; and Archbishop Winchelsey petitioned the Pontiff, "Your devoted daughter, the Church of Canterbury, asks for the pallium, taken from the body of the Blessed Peter, to be granted to its elect, who has been consecrated, in order that he may have the plenitude of his office." But we are not writing a book, only a suggestive fragment; and what has been said may suffice to indicate these two facts: (1) that the English bishops and archbishops, from the days of St. Augustine, would no more have thought of disputing the plenitude of the Pope's power than of, disputing the

right of their temporal sovereign to his civil plenitude; and (2) that *no* temporal king ever said to the Pontiff, "we reject your spiritual jurisdiction"; all that the worst kings ever said was, "you are crossing the frontier-line, which divides the spiritual from the temporal jurisdiction; and *we* choose to be sole judges of that frontier-line, and not to permit you to say where it begins or ends."

IV.

To attempt to describe the religion of all England, from the days of Augustine to Henry VIII., would be superfluous after having described its obedience; for all the world knows that obedience to the Holy See means the whole Roman Catholicism of the present day. No one disputes that the two go together, always have gone together, and always must. Let us then by way of testing continuity, briefly picture the English religion of the last three centuries; not the religion of the quite modern sect, the Ritualist, but of all Anglican Protestants who preceded them. We will not exaggerate, nor indulge in sarcasm. We will only try to picture in a few words the "divine worship" of ninety-nine out of a hundred Anglicans, in their town and country churches and chapels.

An altar, always spoken of as a table; the clergy never called priests, but commonly ministers; holy communion administered only once a month; three boxes piled in front of the communion table—pulpit, reading desk, and clerk's desk—so as to obscure the very remembrance of a Christian altar; the font usually put away into some corner; the clergyman's robe carefully divested of every significance of a sacrificing, an absolving, or a dogmatic order; the church-pews always suggesting that so uninteresting a divine service required exceptional personal ease for its endurance; the sermons frequently flavored with some abuse of Catholic doctrine, and with some praise of the glorious liberties of the national Protestantism; the younger clergy always occupied with matrimonial anticipations, and the elder clergy much more domestic than even Protestant; the bishops "high and dry scholars and lordly magnates, who esteemed a palace as much as they disesteemed a curate"; and the whole religion of the whole Establishment consisting in "Dearly Beloved Brethren," read on Sundays from a hideous wooden reading desk; and supplemented by a poor essay, in which Almighty God was kindly instructed what He ought to believe in regard to the holy Protestant faith.

Continuity! But the Ritualists say, "Ah, see how we have changed all that. We have restored the Church of England to what it was in the earliest centuries; we have brought back Catholicity into Protestant churches; we have wiped out three centuries of vile Erastianism, and have re-clothed our ancient Church with

its first spirit ; we have utterly repudiated the whole work of the Reformers, and have taken back to us a good three-fourths of mediævalism ; stopping short only where obedience to the Holy See would have deprived us of our right to please ourselves. We are therefore now a true branch of the Catholic Church. We refuse to recognize any kind of Protestant dissenter, and so we prove that we possess the power of excommunication. If only the Roman Church would abandon its idea of corporate oneness, and allow that the Church of Christ may be different in different countries, we would gladly give her the right hand of fellowship, and even teach her several truths which she does not know. And it is by this spirit that we prove our continuity."

We naturally ask the Ritualists. Who gave *you* the authority to reconstruct your own national church ; to call your ancestors for three centuries Protestant heretics ; to affirm that they were all wrong in *not* saying Mass, and in not teaching several truths which you call Catholic ? You, the Ritualists, are members of the same church which, for three centuries, has taught the opposite of what you teach ; have you then received a special revelation, or has the divine authority of the *Ecclesia Docens* devolved solely upon *you* ; that you can not only teach the Roman Church, and the Eastern sects ; not only rebuke the Middle Ages and the Augustine age ; but can also teach and rebuke the whole lifetime of your own communion, put all your bishops right, and severely chide even your primates, and claim for yourselves an exclusive Catholic continuity.

For the great difficulty for the Ritualists comes in here : That, whatever authority they possess, they must derive it through their communism alone, and therefore that communism must have always possessed the illumination, the intellectual and the spiritual illumination, which the Ritualists are supposed to have derived from it. Therefore, that communism must have been always competent to determine truth, nay, *did* determine truth, unless it were apostate ; but, if it were apostate, it was no true Church, and the Ritualists have consequently no inheritance. To realize their position, imagine the (impossible) case of the Catholic Church teaching in the sixteenth century that the doctrine of transubstantiation was *de fide* ; and then teaching, in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, that a table ought to be substituted for an altar. The Catholic Church would have to abandon its continuity. Yet the Ritualists, who belong to a church which for three centuries has reviled doctrines which *they* account to be "of faith," want to claim their continuity through that church up to the Church of, say, A. D. 100 ; while affirming that the Church of A. D. 100 was even at that time so purely human, so derelict, that it had already

began to fall into grave error. How can the Church be both divine and not divine? How can a church which has fallen into doctrinal falsehoods be guaranteed against doing so again? How can the Ritualists derive a pure, untainted Catholicity through three centuries of (more or less) doctrinal apostasy; following, as these three centuries are said to have done, upon ten centuries of error in regard to the Popedom; and even these ten centuries following upon five centuries of fallibility, which resulted in perfectly immeasurable wrong teaching? The theory is the very essence of confusion. It is a very chaos of contradiction, intellectual and spiritual; as absurd in the rational order as it is impious in the divine order; besides giving the direct denial to the promise of our Lord, "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it."

V.

In so vast a subject, spreading over a period of nineteen centuries, it has been difficult to take each point in order, as might be done in, say, a hundred and twenty pages. We may now briefly summarize the whole argument, trying to put each point succinctly so as to show that continuity cannot belong to "a kingdom which is divided against itself."

The Catholic idea is that of the Kingdom of God upon earth. It is also the idea of the Christian family, of the family of the Incarnate Son of God. "Son, behold thy mother; mother, behold thy Son," being the beautiful benediction of this one family. Heresy and schism are an absolute impossibility in a family with such an origin, such a purpose. Unity is the prime idea and the necessity. This unity is in chief of three kinds: (1) of visible and conspicuous community; (2) of one and the same doctrinal belief, and (3) of one and the same obedience to authority. The visibility demands a visible head; the perfection of doctrine demands infallibility, and obedience presupposes divine rule.

The Catholic Church has always realized this ideal. No other community has ever done so. We argued, at the beginning of this short paper, that the fact of the early saints all pleading that oneness was the note and characteristic of the true Church proved also the converse, that the absence of that oneness was fatal to the Catholicity of any sect. But oneness was only possible on the condition of obedience to one and the same visible head, and therefore the Popedom was, to even the natural apprehension, an absolute necessity for the Christian Church. As a matter of fact we showed that the Popedom was always accepted as the corner-stone of Christian government, and that the Christian creed and the Christian ritual were never dissociated from that authority which gave to both the divine sanction of authenticity. Above all things

it had to be borne in mind that the Holy Mass was from the first the divine worship of all Christians throughout the world ; around the altar, the tabernacle, where was Jesus Christ, were gathered all hearts, souls and intellects of the Christian family, all other truths being seen or realized by the light which was cast upon them by the ever-abiding presence of the Son of God. Thus oneness of faith, love, obedience was realized in every Catholic Church.

We next briefly touched on three points: (1) the repudiation by the Anglican reformers, and by their formularies, of almost the whole of the distinctively Catholic creed of Christendom ; (2) the assertion by Henry VIII. before his shameless apostasy, of the divine authority and the universality of the Pope's supremacy ; and (3) the consequent absurdity of Henry VIII.'s family of Protestants affecting to have continuity from the Catholic family, save only in the use of words which have lost their sense. Queen Elizabeth's personal creation of a new church—which was only forced upon the nation by penal laws—was then shown to be as purely human as her new orders, the "succession" of such orders being ridiculed by the new clergy and repudiated by all Christendom east and west, and only fictitiously rendered valid by Acts of Parliament and by Queen Elizabeth's own assertion of her pretensions to divine power. In matter, form, intention, such conservations were invalid, the true Catholic priests, like the true Catholic laity, continuing to be in communion with the Holy See ; so that the *Ecclesia Docens* never died out in England, nor was continuity lost for a single moment. The new church of England, the present church, came into existence in the year 1662, and it is this new church which the queen is vowed to defend, which parliament now controls and over which no bishop has any power ; yet within which the bishops receive their jurisdiction from kings, queens, parliaments, prime ministers, which is therefore only a purely civil jurisdiction, and which confers no right to any exercise of spiritual power.

Our next point was to revert to the popular objection, that the "English kings had always resisted Papal pretensions" ; because this delusion is made to do duty for sound argument against the continuity of English Catholics from the early Church. It was a controversy which could not possibly be avoided, in any suggestive argument as to continuity ; and the line we took was this—and we are convinced of its historical accuracy, as Hallam, Lingard, Macaulay clearly show—that there was never any denial of Papal authority ; there was only quarrelling about the precise position of the frontier-line, which divided things spiritual from things temporal. It would have been strange indeed, if, in the long period of nineteen centuries, there had not been frequent conflicts between the two powers ; seeing that the very object of

the spiritual power, its divine mission, its reason of being, was to subject the world to divine principles of truth, to teach kings as well as peoples their whole duty, and always to protect oppressed Christians against their tyrants, of whom there were sure to be a great many in nineteen centuries. And since the very tyrants who resisted Papal counsel were forced to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See; were forced to acknowledge that the whole of Christendom had always believed in the first principle, that the Head of the Christian Church was Christ's Vicar; their resistance was only the resistance of human nature; it was not the repudiating or the questioning of the Catholic faith. Henry VIII. was the single example of a tyrant who wrote a book to convict himself of apostasy; assuring Christendom in his virtuous days that the Papal supremacy was a divine power, and, in his vicious days, transferring that power to himself. Yet Henry VIII. was only an exaggeratedly bad man, who had many predecessors in the arts of kingly cunning.

Our last point was the contrast between the religion of the Middle Ages and the religion of three centuries of Protestantism; two extremes, two adverse principles, two mortal foes, which had positively nothing in common but an historical belief in Christianity, and in the natural sentiment which is inseparable from such a fact. So that it was easy to show that continuity from Catholic truth was an impossibility for the Protestants of three centuries; and since the Ritualists derive their continuity from Protestants, and also impute falsehood to pre-Reformation teaching, their continuity, if they have any, must be of so very mixed a kind that it must have a good deal more of Protestantism than of Ritualism.

VI.

This ends our controversy. Yet we may be permitted to add a word in conclusion, on what we may call the moral aspect of the question; the common sense estimate of the whole matter; apart from wranglings about historic details, human conflicts, which really cannot affect the subject, supernaturally.

Anglicans admit that Christianity is divine, that the Catholic Church is, as it were, the "Second Incarnation"; that one Lord, one faith, one baptism, is the fact as well as the idea of that Incarnation; that therefore heresy is deadly sin, shivering the unity of Christ's Church; and schism is like the frightful revolt in a Christian family, which makes the household to be a hell on earth instead of a heaven; in short, they admit that the Church was a divine institution, designed to include all men in all ages,

whatever their natural varieties in point of character, or their secular or temporal history or tradition.

Here they stop. Directly they come to apply these abstract ideas it is seen that they find them practically unworkable. The Church, they say, is a teaching power, not subject to corruption, yet somehow it is always tumbling into deadly error; it is the Rock against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, yet somehow they have prevailed against it for sixteen centuries; it is necessarily, as it were, essentially, immutable, being a divine not a human institution, yet, strange to say, it is one thing at one time, and another thing at another time, and even many different things at the same time; possibly almost perfect in the primitive times, but then corrupt at its very roots for many centuries; and only to be found in these latter days in its perfect integrity in the little sect of the Ritualists within the Church of England.

Realizing the "baseless fabric" of such a Church, the Ritualists try to believe that their continuity is derived from the fountain head of the earliest times; utterly heedless of the fact that continuity through non-continuousness is both naturally and supernaturally an impossibility. That which has come to an end, as did primitive infallibility (according to the wide theory of the Ritualists) cannot be renewed by its inherent power. The inherent power is gone, and gone forever. Henceforth fallibility becomes the sole pledge of divine doctrines for all Christians in all ages to the end of the world. Thus fallibility is the continuity of infallibility; an assertion as absurd as that infallibility can become fallible, or that the fallible can re-invest itself with infallibility. If the Church ever *was* divine, it *is* divine. If the Church was ever able to say, "This is true, that is false," then, just as it said so in the days of Pelagius¹ so does it say infallibly in this century, "this is true, that is false;" nor is there any continuity of Christianity without obedience. Disobedience is most certainly a continuity; it is the continuity of Adam's sin—and of Pelagius's; but to say that it is the continuity of Christianity is to fly in the face of common sense, natural morality. What must be called the moral aspect of continuity is as easy to be judged of in Christianity as in any inheritance which is grounded on natural law; and the continuity of the Ritualists is exactly the same as the continuity of disowned and, disinherited, wayward sons. When the Ritualist says to the Catholic Church, "you are wrong; *we* alone are heirs of the

¹ Pelagius, by the way, was a British heretic; and after he was excommunicated by the Holy See, he wrote to the Pope, "I desire to be corrected by you, who hold both Peter's faith and See; but if this my confession is approved by the judgment of your apostleship, then whosoever endeavors to cast blots on me will prove himself either ignorant, or malicious, or not a Catholic."

pure faith of the primitive church ; *our* infallibility extends to the supreme judgment of our own church, of all the Middle Ages, and, of course, specially and radically, of the Holy See ; and *we* in the plenitude of our apostolic wisdom, pronounce ourselves to be continuous—not from *you*, not from the Middle Ages, not from the faith of the canonized saints of a dozen centuries, but from that infallibility which died out before Augustine, to be renewed only by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Littledale, and a few other chosen spirits of modern Anglicanism ” ; we cannot help asking to be excused from grave argument, for it is difficult to be grave about such trifling. Continuity of disobedience from obedience ; of personal, individual infallibility from the infallibility of the undivided Catholic Church ; of the spiritual headship of Queen Victoria, of her parliaments and privy councils, from that of the Supreme Pontificate of St. Peter ; of a parliamentary form of divine service from the Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass ; of two sacraments from Seven Sacraments : of a married clergy from an unmarried priesthood ; of no confession from habitual confession ; of no religious orders from many religious orders ; of a hundred different opinions, views, interpretations, from one and the same faith in all ages, in all countries, and under every test of secular or heretical opposition ; of the Thirty-nine Articles from General Councils ; of the “ Canterbury ” of to-day from the Canterbury of St. Anselm or of St. Thomas ; of the modern Westminster Abbey from the abbey of the Confessor ; or of the comfortable, domestic closes of the cathedrals from the monasticism and the celibacy of Catholic rule ; of one incessant roar of doctrinal strife and newspaper theologies from the “ still, small voice ” of the Holy Spirit of God, directing all intellects to know and believe the same truths, while leaving them free to question everything that was not “ of faith ” ; of—but we may sum it all up in one word, the continuity of the human from the divine ! Common sense is the only “ theologian ” that is wanted. Not until chaos can be continuity of the divine order, or exact contraries the continuity of identities, can the Church of England establish her claim to Catholic unity with the One, Holy, Undivided CHURCH OF CHRIST.

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

COMPOSTELLA AND THE SHRINE OF ST. JAMES.

A YACHT bound on a delightful summer cruise, and bearing a party bent on mingled pleasure and instruction, has only, on leaving New York, to steer her course to the east along the 41st parallel of latitude to reach Oporto or the mouth of the Minho. This beautiful river separates Portugal from the Spanish province of Galicia, "the Bay Country," *el país de las Rias*. The seafarer, continuing to sail northward along these enchanting shores, will find such a succession of magnificent estuaries, broad, deep, and penetrating far into the land, as is to be met with nowhere else in the Old World. The deep bays which indent the south and western coasts of Ireland can alone compare with the glorious *rias* of Vigo, Pontevedra and Arosa. Twice a year the iron-clad fleets of Great Britain select the broad bosom of the last-named estuary for their evolutions.

The soil and climate of this favored land would make the traveller from Asia fancy himself back again on the fairest shores of Palestine and Syria. And, in good sooth, the intelligent and enterprising Phœnicians, from the earliest historic ages, were not slow in finding out this early home of the Gael, and in establishing—from *Gades*, the modern Cadiz, and *Hispalis*, the Seville of our day, to Cape Finisterre—profitable marts for the exchange of the rich stuffs, the beautiful pottery, and other products of Phœnician industry.

Up the calm, sunny waters of that superb Bay of Arosa, the largest and northernmost of the Galician estuaries, a Phœnician trading-vessel was sailing about the year of Our Lord 43. It threaded its way securely among the many lovely islands which gem the upper portion of the bay, until it entered the deep stream of the Ulla, and cast anchor before the Roman town or municipium of Iria Flavia. On this vessel were Theodore and Athanasius, two of the devoted disciples of the Apostle James the Elder, and his fellow-laborers in Spain before the latter's journey to Jerusalem during the great famine of the years 40 and 41 (A. D.). James, like the other Apostles dispersed over the surface of the Roman empire, had hastened to Jerusalem to bring the alms of the Spanish Christians to their famine-stricken brethren of Palestine.¹

The persecuting rage of the Pharisees and Sadducees was roused to increased violence by the presence in Jerusalem of the Apostles

¹ See Acts of the Apostles xi., 28, 29, 30; xii., 1 and following.

and their disciples. St. James must have distinguished himself above his brethren by his characteristic zeal and outspokenness; for he drew on himself the chief hatred of the Sanhedrim and the animadversion of King Herod. Now about that time, "Herod the king stretched forth his hands to afflict some of the Church. And he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword. And, seeing that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take up Peter also. Now it was in the days of the Azymes. And when he had apprehended him, he cast him into prison, . . . intending after the Pasch to bring him forth to the people."¹

So James, who, with Peter and John, had been privileged to witness the Transfiguration of Our Lord on Mount Thabor, and was chosen to be with Him during the terrible agony of His soul in the Garden of Olives, was the first of the apostolic company to shed his blood in Jerusalem. He drank the cup of Christ's passion during the Eastertide and in the holy city. Peter was selected as a still more pleasing victim for the sacrifice, to be offered to the popular fury ere the paschal solemnities were ended. But Peter's appointed work was not yet accomplished; and God's angel saved him from Herod and the Jews.

The faithful companions of the martyred James obtained possession of his body, bore it in all haste and secrecy to the nearest seaport, Joppa, where they happily found a Phœnician merchantman bound for the southwestern coast of Spain. On this they embarked with their treasure, trusting to Providence for a safe issue to their voyage.

A numerous band of the disciples of the Apostle-martyr soon joined Athanasius and Theodore. Their names, to the number of thirteen, are mentioned by the early Spanish annalists, and by Bolandus and Henschius in the "*Acta Sanctorum*." These zealous and faithful fellow-workers had not been idle among the Gael while James and his two companions were performing the errand of charity and zeal which ended so tragically in Jerusalem. And now that the Apostle of Spain had been brought back in death to rest forever in the field of his labors, far away from the shore of his native sea of Galilee, there were fervent Christians to meet him at Iria Flavia. One of them, a Gallo-Roman lady, named Lupa, helped the disciples in their need, and had the body of her beloved master conveyed with all due secrecy into the interior of the country, in an ox-cart, such as farmers used. This was to baffle the jealous vigilance of the hostile Jews and Pagans.

Arrived at a property of her own, she surrendered to Athanasius and Theodore the marble sarcophagus prepared beforehand for

¹ *Ibidem* xii., 1-4.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, Februarii, tom. i., p. 6.

her own burial, as was then the custom. Her family vault was on the face of a hillock amid a grove of larch and oak. There they set about erecting over the tomb-vaulted chamber, one of the *Memoriæ*, or memorial chapels, so often mentioned by the Christian writers of the early ages of the Church.

This hillock, and the farm of which it was a part, have borne ever since the name of Libredon, most probably from their being the free gift (*Liberum donum*) of the proprietress, Lupa, to the Apostle, her father in Christ. The hillock itself was only the spur of a neighboring mountain, known popularly as Monte Burgo.

This sacred *Memoria* on the hillside, containing the body of St. James the Elder, is the centre around which has grown up the glorious city of St. James (Santiago), with its great cathedral and the magnificent monastic edifices and hospitals for pilgrims, which were the wonder of Christendom ever since the end of the ninth century. Mountain, hillside, and the neighboring slopes and valleys, all form the site on which piety and history have bestowed the appellation of Compostella (*Campus Stellæ*), "the field of the star." How aptly this name was given we shall presently see.

In course of time the two inseparable companions in life and death of St. James, Athanasius and Theodore, closed their career, and were buried by the side of their venerated master. Long before this, however, and as soon as the memorial chapel had been completed, the majority of the thirteen disciples, leaving a few behind them to minister to the spiritual wants of the Galician Christians, set out for Rome, obtained episcopal consecration at the hands of St. Peter, and then returned to Spain to continue the work of their apostleship.

The history of the Church, in this part of the Iberian Peninsula, is surrounded with no little obscurity during the remainder of the first century and down to the era of Constantine the Great. This same obscurity hangs over the fate of the memorial chapel at Libredon. It is easily accounted for.

The persecution which, under successive emperors from Nero down, raged in Rome and throughout Italy against the Christian name, was, generally speaking, far more relentless in the Provinces of the Roman empire than in the neighborhood of the Capital. The annals and traditions of almost every city of Italy attest the foundation of each principal see, either by some disciple of the Apostles, or, by a follower of these immediate disciples. Thus, Ravenna which, in the first and second centuries, was the great imperial shipyard and military storehouse of the vast Roman fleets, was evangelized by St. Apollinaris, ordained bishop by St. Peter, and appointed to the work of the apostolate in Ravenna. Apollinaris shed his blood in defence of the flock he had gathered to Christ;

so did more than one of his successors. So was it with Milan, in the north of Italy, and with Naples in the south. Nor did it fare otherwise with the churches of Asia, Africa, and Greece. St. James the Younger was stoned to death in Jerusalem, and his successors in that see, for centuries, only looked forward to a bloody death as to the natural inheritance left by their predecessors. We all know, in Asia Minor what befel St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist; and St. Ignatius, and St. Irenæus. It was the same heroic tale of suffering told in every part of the empire. That the persecution should have been less fierce along the Ulla and the Minho might be accounted for by the remoteness of this land of the Gael, and by the peaceful habits of a pastoral people, sheltered by their forests and mountains. We know how plentifully the blood of Christians flowed in the south and east of Spain, as well as in the north, in Seville, in Valencia, in Barcelona, and in Saragossa.

However, long before the Roman emperors had ceased to wage war on the unresisting followers of Christ, or the proconsuls and magistrates in the provinces had ceased to hunt them down or proscribe them, the barbarian invasions began to shake, wave upon wave in quick succession, the mighty fabric of the Roman power. The barbarians, at first, were no less ferocious enemies of Christianity, no less unsparing destroyers of such Christian edifices as dared to appear above ground, than the pagans of Rome and Greece, of Africa and Asia. The fertile regions of southern Gaul fell an easy prey to the invading hordes, who soon poured across the Pyrenees.

Between the unrelenting persecutions of their Roman masters and the destructive ferocity of the first barbarian invaders, the Christians of Spain knew no rest from evil. The Suevi, who possessed themselves of Galicia, were, if anything, more cruel and oppressive than either Goth or Vandal. The Christian societies on either shore of the Bay of Arosa, or along the course of the Ulla and the neighboring streams, were either exterminated or reduced to slavery, or driven to the hospitable fastnesses of the Asturian mountains. Thus fared it with generation after generation of the much tried Christians of Galicia. All local traditions were lost among the scattered and suffering remnants of the Gallo-Roman population evangelized by Saints Athanasius and Theodore.

Iria Flavia was ruined. The forest protected from observation the lowly memorial chapel with its treasures. To be sure, the tradition continued throughout Spain that her apostle had been buried in Galicia. But in Galicia itself the accumulated misfortunes of so many ages had blotted out from the memory of men all knowledge of the precise spot which contained his relics. The Suevi,

who kept their grip on the fair and fertile lands of Galicia, were Arians, like the Visigoths who held sway throughout the rest of Spain down to the Moorish invasion. So that everything among the Christian Celts of northwestern Spain, during these troublous centuries, tended but little toward reviving the memories of the hallowed dead.

When the Mohammedans, in the eighth century, possessed themselves of the fairest provinces of Spain, the men who fought for faith and country found a safe asylum, an impregnable stronghold in the Asturias. The Galicians, then forming in language and blood one great community with the Portuguese, opposed a mighty barrier to the progress of the infidels.

Meanwhile a town of some four or five hundred souls had arisen near the hill which held the *Memoria* of St. James and his two disciples. This town bore the name of San Fins¹ de Lovio, and the forest-covered hill that had so long kept the secret of its buried treasure was known as Monte Burgo de Libredon. Their population formed a part of the diocese of Iria Flavia; for that Roman Municipium, like the Imperial City of Braga beyond the Minho, remained amid its ruin and decay an episcopal see.

The tide of warfare between the Mohammedan invaders and the Christian princes was then (about 813) rolling, back and forth unceasingly, its fierce waves from the foothills of the Asturias to Cadiz and Valencia. From Cordova, the capital of the Moslem power in the peninsula, the conquering infidels seemed to be strengthening their hold on the country, if not extending their possessions. It was the first stage of that sublime struggle of seven hundred years by a Christian people against their irreconcilable foes, of which history affords no parallel save in Catholic Ireland's battle of centuries against British Protestantism.

The period from 770 to 820 was, according to the rich and beautiful literature describing the last heroic enterprises of Charlemagne and his barons, the time when the emperor crossed the Pyrenees at their head to drive back the Moslems to Africa, and to free from their yoke the tomb of the Apostle, St. James. Certain it is, that the current traditions, dating from the beginning of the ninth century, and embodied in the romantic recitals of the age, tell us how the emperor, at Aix-la-Chapelle, was warned in a vision of the dangers which threatened the extinction of Christianity in Spain, and was clearly shown the road which was to lead him and his soldiers to Iria Flavia, and the then undiscovered shrine which held the remains of St. James and his two disciples. All this is stated at length in the writings of Padre Fita and other Spanish

¹ Written also "Finns." The early local annalists call it also "St. Felix."

archæologists, who have, in our day, thrown such light around Compostella and its hallowed memories.

Without pronouncing any judgment on the historical value of these legends, certain it is, that in the year 813, according to Archdeacon Zepedano's sober and conscientious history,¹ it pleased Our Lord to comfort and strengthen the Christian hosts who were battling for the faith in Spain, by revealing to them miraculously the burial-place of His beloved companion, apostle, and martyr.

There exists abundant documentary evidence dating from the ninth century and the ages immediately following, which go to attest all the facts connected with the revelation or re-discovery of the Apostle's tomb and the authenticity of his remains.

It happened during the pontificate of St. Leo III. (795-816) and the reign of Alfonso II., surnamed the Chaste, who was king of the Asturias and Leon from 793 to 842. There is a letter of the holy Pope to the bishops of Spain congratulating them on the re-discovery of the body of St. James, acknowledging its authenticity, reciting the facts of the Apostle's labor in the peninsula, his martyrdom in Jerusalem, the translation of his remains to Iria Flavia and their burial not far from that sea-port. It is the same ground covered by the bull of the Thirteenth Leo, *Deus Omnipotens*, issued on November the 1st, 1884, after two of the most thorough, judicial, and scientific investigations ever instituted.

The most ancient narrative of the discovery of the Memorial Chapel is given in a ninth century manual of a noble Brotherhood, known as the Caballeros Cambeadores of Santiago, who were, immediately after the finding of the tomb and the identification of the remains, founded in Compostella by Alfonso-the-Chaste to watch over the basilica he was rearing above the tomb. Their duties also comprised the guidance and protection of pilgrims, procuring them hospitality, changing gratuitously the money brought with them from abroad into the local Galician currency. This kind office secured foreign pilgrims from the impositions practised even in the ninth century by the money-changers, who were for the most part Jews. It also gave rise to the name popularly given to this Brotherhood—the Cambeadores. By the royal decree instituting this Protective Society of knights none were admitted to membership but the sons of the highest nobility. We see here the origin of the Knights of Santiago or St. James of Compostella and the other orders of chivalry founded to protect pilgrims on their way to and from the shrine of the Apostle.

But let us see how St. Finns de Libredon came to be called Compostella, and how the Memorial Chapel and its treasure were

¹ *Historia de la Basilica Compostellana*, p. 12.

found anew. We translate from the Manual of the Cambeadores, written in the ancient local or Galician dialect :

"This book," it says, "relates the origin of the Cambeadores of the Church of St. James (*Santiago*), and how the body of St. James in its full integrity was revealed.

"It had remained hidden away in a marble sarcophagus in an underground cave formed of two stone vaults. This cave was in the middle space of Monte Burgo of Libredon, and at the foot of the village of St. Finns de Solobio, in the canton of Bonaval. In the place was also another village called Caminho¹ from the name of the road leading directly to the Church of the Apostle.

"St. Finns then counted some 400 inhabitants. Below it was a lofty spur or hillock covered with a forest growth of larches and great gnarled oaks. In the midst of this wooded steep people began to see bright lights accompanied with harmonious voices. Stars also appeared. There was one oak tree towering above the others, and over it would shine forth a star-like body surpassing the other lights in splendor.

"Thereupon San Payo, a hermit who was wont to celebrate Mass for the inhabitants of St. Finns informed Theodomir, Bishop of Iria Flavia, of these manifestations. The bishop forthwith set out with his priests and attendants, arriving at Solobio on the 24th day of July. Taking up his abode with his suite in a castle belonging to one of his relatives, a gentleman by name Espanya, he watched the phenomena from his lofty position. In the middle of the night appeared the lights with the star-like bodies—among these the bright star above the giant oak.

"The next morning the holy bishop sang Mass in Solobio, and then went to where this great oak tree stood. They cleared away the forest growth until they came to the holy cave. On entering it they saw that it had been skilfully constructed with its double arched vault. There was a small altar, and beneath it a sarcophagus covered with a slab. Two other sarcophagi stood one on each side of the altar, but lower than the central tomb.

"They (the bishop and his people) began a solemn supplication, the entire population fasting. Then, as if by inspiration, they opened the middle sarcophagus and saw that they had found the body of the holy apostle. For the head was detached from the trunk and he held a pilgrim's staff wrapped in a lettered scroll, which said : ' Here lieth James the son of Zebedee and of Salome, the brother of John—who was put to death by Herod in Jerusalem and came by sea with his two disciples as far as Iria Flavia in Galicia, and was thence borne hither in an ox cart belonging to Lupa, the owner of this field. Further they did not wish to go.'

¹ The original text is in the old Gallego or Galician dialect common to Galicia and Portugal, which formed one political province down to the twelfth century.

“‘Cecilius, disciple of the apostle, together with the other disciples, erected this.’”¹

Fortunately there exist in more than one martyrology in use before the ninth century the most explicit attestations of the prevailing belief that the Apostle St. James had preached the Gospel in Spain, and that, after his martyrdom in Jerusalem, his body had been carried to this field of his labors and buried there. Then, it has ever been the constant tradition in Galicia, that the episcopal see of Iria Flavia was founded by the Apostle.

Bishop Theodomir lost no time in informing his sovereign, Alfonso II., of the discovery of the Memorial Chapel at Libredon, and of the preternatural phenomena which had led to it. Meanwhile the population far and near, moved by the discovery and by the miracles performed in the cave on the hillside, were pouring into St. Finns.

On this steep hillside, above the memorial chapel and the triple tomb, soon arose a basilica, with a group of monastic institutions belonging to the Order of St. Benedict, the zealous monks ministering to the spiritual needs of the ever-increasing multitude of pilgrims. The mountain of Libredon, with the forest-clad spurs and hillocks around, and the valley beneath, were from that year of 813 called Compostella in the Galician tongue (*Campus Stellæ*, the field of the star). On this favored site soon grew rapidly the historic Santiago, the city of St. James.

Alfonso II. hastened with the foremost amongst his clergy and nobles to come to Libredon, and with them bore solemn witness to the facts authenticated by Bishop Theodomir, the saintly hermit of Payo, and the populations of Solobio and Caminho.

The abrupt hillside was a most unfavorable site for the erection of a large church edifice. But the sturdy and intelligent builders of the ninth and succeeding centuries were accustomed to overcome difficulties which would appal our modern architects. They cut down the steep slope so as to construct, on a level with the top of the arched memorial chapel, a vast platform on which were laid the foundations of the contemplated basilica, bearing the name of San Salvador, in honor of the Saviour for whom St. James had shed his blood. In the church thus built the high altar was placed directly over that in the crypt or cave beneath, where reposed the body of the apostle with his two faithful companions. The entire building, as well as that of the adjoining Benedictine Monastery, was planned and constructed with an eye to solidity and security. The pagan Norsemen were scouring the northern and southern seas and making ruthless war on every religious edifice. The terrible Mos-

¹ *Historia y Descripción Arqueológica de la Basilica Compostelana*, por el Doctor D. Jose Zepedano, Lugo, 1870.

lem hordes were carrying desolation into every part of Spain left exposed to their incursions. Alfonso-the-Chaste wisely determined to secure, in so far as he could, the newly discovered tomb and its priceless treasures against the sudden attacks of all enemies of the Christian name. Thus the Basilica of the Saviour with the adjoining edifices, resembled more a fortress than a peaceful house of prayer. Things remained in this state for upwards of seventy years. Alphonso II. had endeavored to provide generously for the support of the clergy, both regular and secular, by granting them (or rather St. James himself) the ownership in fee simple of the land for a circuit of three miles, together with taxes and revenue derived from other places.¹ Then it was that Pope Leo III. to whom King Alfonso made known all that had just happened in the Field of the Star, wrote his letter of congratulation.²

Under Alfonso III., in July, 896, a new and more spacious edifice was begun. This was consecrated in May, 899, in presence of the royal family, seventeen bishops, and a vast concourse of all classes. In 977 this edifice was destroyed by the celebrated Almanzor, the Vizier of Hiquem or Hixem II., Caliph of Cordova. Almanzor thought, in his fanatical hatred of Christianity, that by destroying the Shrine of Compostella he should deal a mortal blow to Christianity in Spain, yet he did not, nevertheless, succeed in violating the tomb of the Apostle. This could only be reached through an opening in the floor of the upper church. When the ruthless conqueror penetrated to the crypt, he found, seated before the shrine, a man,—a monk some say,—of venerable and majestic aspect, who reproached Almanzor with all the blood he had shed, and the sacrileges he had committed, and told him that the justice of God would strike him down before he could return to Cordova.

Almanzor had already despoiled the basilica of its treasures. The bells he had taken down from the towers and sent on before him, with the beautiful doors of the temple, to Cordova, borne on the shoulders of the captive citizens of Compostella. After having levelled to the ground as much as time would permit him of the upper church, and burned the monastery and city, Almanzor set forth on other expeditions. Victory followed his standards everywhere till he came to Medina-Celi. There a fearful pestilence resembling Asiatic cholera fell suddenly on his army, and threatened its utter extermination. Almanzor himself was seized by the

¹ See the Royal Diploma, in Don José Zepedano's *History*, pp. 34 and 35.

² This letter, Don Zepedano assures us (p. 14), has been verified by Mgr. Giovanni Grimaldi, Prefect of the Vatican Archives. It is, moreover, quoted at length in the great manuscript work, *The Book of Calistus II.* (1119-1124), preserved in the treasury of Compostella, and which Cardinal Paya was thinking of publishing while the writer was in Galicia (1882-83).

avenging plague, and died amid the most excruciating tortures, declaring to his attendants that, "in all his vast army there was not one man so much to be pitied as their chief."

Meanwhile the spoils of Compostella, with the cathedral doors and bells, were received in triumph in Cordova. The doors adorned the entrance to the great mosque, and the bells, plated with gold and silver, were hung up and used as lamps in the mosque itself. There King St. Ferdinand found them, when, on June 30, 1235, he entered Cordova as conqueror. He compelled the ministers and guardians of the mosque to carry the bells back to Compostella on their own shoulders. It was a just application of the *lex talionis*.¹

But the stout-hearted Galicians were not prevented by the ruin wrought by Almanzor from repairing, without a day's delay, the ruin he had caused in Santiago. King Bermudo II. made it his especial care to rebuild and enlarge the basilica and to fortify it against sudden attacks. It was then reconsecrated,—a far more beautiful edifice than before.

In the eleventh century the Northmen invaded Galicia a second time; and the Bishop, Don Cresconio, who had performed a heroic part in repelling the invaders, not only fortified the junction of the Rio de Padron with the Sar, but surrounded Compostella with high and strong walls, and erected on the west front of the cathedral two great towers which were deemed impregnable.

With the conversion of the Northmen to Christianity and the repression in Spain of the Mohammedan pride and power, the long-felt need of a more spacious church edifice gave rise to the great Cathedral of St. James, as it now stands with its successive modifications. We say "great" in a qualified sense. It was, on account of the declivity on which the primitive memorial chapel had been erected, found extremely difficult to rear a structure rivalling in length and breadth the great thirteenth century cathedrals of Burgos, Toledo, or even Leon. But the aim of the builders was to afford accommodation, on the great jubilee festivals, to the enormous crowds of pilgrims who flocked to the Shrine. Men came from every country in Christendom to the Shrine of St. James, drawn by the wish of reviving within their own souls the dried up or slowly flowing springs of Christian piety, or of atoning for heinous public sins by generous and heroic public penance, or, again, by the hope of obtaining near the tomb of the Apostle relief from some grievous and inveterate infirmity. They came thither to pray, to weep for their sins, not to

¹ Such is the account given of Almanzor's last expedition and death by Señor Don Joaquin Guichot, the historian of Seville.

witness the splendors of public worship. These they could behold at home, without risking long journeys over sea and land.

What the Bishop—Diego Pelaez I.—and his successors sought and obtained in enlarging as far as they could the existing basilica, was to erect as many confessionals as possible in the lengthened aisles and multiplied chapels of the new twelfth century cathedral. The Shrine of the Apostle was, in the design of the Redeemer of souls, an abundant and overflowing fountain of life within His Temple; it behooved the chief pastors there to have the cleansing and life-giving waters placed everywhere within the sacred precincts within reach of the thirsty and fainting multitudes. This design was admirably carried out by the men who began the reconstruction and enlargement of the Basilica on July 11th, 1078.

Guide books and superficial writers on Spanish subjects and localities tell their readers that the names of the architects and artists who superintended this restoration, and left such remarkable works behind them, are utterly forgotten. Well, it so happens that Aymeric, the Secretary of Calixtus II., who visited Compostella with this Pope about 1110 (and while the latter was only Archbishop of Vienne), assures us that this restoration was begun in 1078, under the direction of "Master Bernardo, a wonderful old man" (*senex mirabilis magister*), and of Master Roberto. What wonders these two distinguished architects achieved inside and outside the cathedral we are faithfully told in the "Book of Callistus II." At the time, however, when Aymeric and his master visited Compostella, not only was the cathedral unfinished, but, in 1117, the interior was utterly ruined by fire.

This was caused by the Spaniards themselves, unhappily. Dona Urraca, daughter of Alfonso VI. of Leon, had married the Count of Burgundy, brother of the Archbishop of Vienne, soon to be Pope Calixtus II. Her husband died before Alfonso VI., leaving after him an infant son, so famous afterward as Alfonso VII., El Emperador. Dona Urraca next married Alfonso I., King of Aragon, who, refusing to acknowledge the Salic Law prevailing in the Kingdom of Leon, upheld his wife's rights to the crown as against those of her infant son. An Aragonese army invaded Galicia, ravaging and destroying with barbaric ferocity. They possessed themselves of Compostella; and it was while they were contending there for the mastery that the cathedral was burned.

The Archbishop of Vienne, with his secretary, Aymeric, hastened to Galicia, to defend the rights of his nephew, the infant Alfonso VII. In Compostella he was charmed with the magnificent piety of citizens and pilgrims. His book, begun and almost finished near the Shrine of the Apostle, was completed and further added to in Rome, while he occupied the papal throne. It is one of the wonders of mediæval literature.

The Mohammedans were not slow in profiting by these feuds between the Christian princes. All through the twelfth century, as before, the most determined efforts were made by the former to regain the provinces from which they had been driven. The youth, the boyhood almost, of Alfonso VII. was spent in arms, who thereby prepared himself for the great successes which won him the title of El Emperador. Meanwhile the resources of his kingdom were taxed to the utmost to maintain a strife seemingly endless. Things came to such a pass that the Archbishop and Chapter of Compostella were forced not only to surrender the funds collected for rebuilding the cathedral, but to give up for a time their own revenues.

According to Don Zepedano, when Ferdinand II. came in pilgrimage to Compostella in 1168, the Church of the Apostle was in a pitiful condition. The ruin caused by the fire of 1117 had only been very partially repaired. The interior of the edifice was filled with scaffolding, while the impoverished clergy had no funds to continue the work, and the western nave with its aisles were scarcely begun. The king had brought with him the most skilled architect he could find, the "Master Matthew," now so well known throughout the English-speaking world. To this energetic worker the king entrusted the completion of the cathedral, providing him with ample means for the undertaking.

Master Matthew inspired his workmen with his own spirit, and in 1188, on the 1st of April, the edifice was completed, and the glorious triple arch of the western portico was thrown open to the public. It is still known by the name of *La Gloria*. It is so called from the colossal figure of Christ, enthroned in glory, in the tympanum of the central door. A modern Spanish writer, Villa-Amil, does not exaggerate the merit of this grand work of Christian art, when he says that this portico, considered as a monumental piece of iconography, may well be esteemed as the most excellent in existence.

It is an epic in stone. In the tympanum of the central door Christ is seated on His throne and in the act of judging the living and the dead. With Him are the apostles as His assessors. The Judge displays the wounds in His hands, feet, and side. Angels on each side bear the instruments of His passion. Above the throne in the semi-circular vaulted space are seated the twenty-four elders described by St. John in the Apocalypse, all seated and half of them bearing harps, while the other half bear cups full of perfumes—the prayers of all God's saints. Two semi-circular and concentric lines of smaller figures above the thrones of the apostles and evangelists represent the multitudes of the blessed; some of them are already crowned, while others receive crowns from the

ministering angels, and others again hold books and scrolls to which they point with the finger. These are the teachers and guides of the generations among whom they live.

So much, in brief, for the tympanum and vaulting of the central door. That to your left, or the northern door with its wealth of sculpture, represents paradise. There is a world of vegetation, typical of the garden of everlasting delights, amid whose shady depths one beholds two concentric ranks of figures bearing palm branches. The corresponding space above the southern door—to your right—are the multitudes of the damned. Here the scenes of the resurrection, of the separation of the just from the wicked, and of the effects of the final doom, are graphically pictured, or rather suggested in a few masterly and eloquent touches. The whole space, above and below, is alive with the episodes of this tremendous drama.

But the last judgment, the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem and the misery of the eternally lost, are not the sole themes which the mediæval poet-artist has here treated. The life of Christ on earth and the destinies of His Church, as well as the struggles of every individual soul among His followers, are either most beautifully and clearly delineated in the lower portions of this sublime composition, or so admirably symbolized as to be intelligible to the minds of the worshipping multitudes. The exquisite grouped columns which support the central tympanum, or from which spring the arches and vaulting, are together with their pedestals and capitals, all one living mass of historical sculpture. The architects and artists who reared the church of St. James in Compostella, like those who contemporaneously labored to make of the cathedral of St Mark in Venice, "the Book of the Lamb written within and without," were inspired and directed by the same living faith. Amid the "Field of the Star" as on the blue waters of the Lagunes, around the shrine of the great son of Zebedee and Salomé as around the tomb of the second evangelist, Catholic art, like some workman sent down from the heavenly Jerusalem, created immortal masterpieces, embodying in stone which breathes and lives and speaks, the story of Christ's infinite love and the terrors of His justice.

The onyx pillar which faces you in the group supporting the tympanum of the middle porch, is covered with sculptures representing the double genealogy of Christ, His human ancestry according to Mary, His mother, and His eternal birth as the One Son of the One Living God. Look up to where the Father holds on His knees and presents to the adoring love of men and angels His Son made man and crucified for our redemption, while the Holy Spirit, as the dove, proceeds from both, and with outstretched wings prepares to descend and transform this lower world.

Then let your eyes rest on the capital of that pillar-group, and admire how *Maestro Mateo* could make the rough, dull, cold stone tell the story of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, whither the Holy Spirit had borne Him after His baptism. It was to teach every one of us, every human being who professes to follow Christ, how to open his own soul to that same Holy Spirit, and with His help to overcome this lower world. Nay; look down at the pedestal of the column, and see that human figure prostrate beneath the superincumbent mass and strangling these monstrous animals, which figure forth the worldly spirits of pride and sensuality.

The salient columns at the angles of each sustaining group are covered with a spiral growth of vegetation, like the mighty trees in a tropical forest, and among their leafage you see figures of men and animals pursuing each other—the lively image of man's perpetual battle with the animal instincts of his earthly nature.

In this unavoidable strife, the disciple of Christ has only to lift his eyes to the Model, Master, and Judge above him, and to open his heart to the ever ready grace of the Holy Ghost. The *Sursum Corda* which echoes from this grand page of sculpture, is, to him who has an eye to read, an intelligence to understand, and a heart to nobly dare, as thrilling as the divinest chant of preface that ever pealed through the aisles of the cathedral within.

I shall merely add that in the northern door you have the prophets who announced the coming of Christ, and in the southern porch the Apostles who were His companions, the founders of His Church, and the fathers of the modern civilized world.¹

Shall we, citizens of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and other great cities of the union, never have casts of this great work of *Maestro Mateo*? I ask the question now, as we are preparing to celebrate the centenary of Columbus, and to recall some at least of the glories of the great country which sent Columbus to discover the western world.

The western front as left by the architect in 1188, although embellished by works of such transcendent excellence, in no wise resembled the west front of Rheims or Amiens, of Notre Dame de Paris, of Bourges or of Chartres. The structure as beheld from the adjoining square, with its double sweep of lofty ballustrated steps, around what seemed a central door leading to the crypt, had as much the appearance of a fortified castle, as of a church edifice. The majestic front itself with its towers, although made a thing of beauty and a joy forever by *Maestro Mateo*, was evidently

¹ In 1866 Signor Buicciari was commissioned by the Directors of the Kensington Museum to obtain an exact cast in plaster of the portico *La Gloria*. It would be a patriotic act in our great municipalities in the United States to get casts of the same for the instruction of our architects.

constructed so as to resist some sudden attack from the Moslem. And the mighty hosts which the Moorish emperors led into Spain at that same period, fully justified the design of the architect.

But, let us enter the portal of *La Gloria* as it was thrown open to the public on the day of the restored temple's consecration, April 1, 1188. The architect, who, like his brother-artists of the Middle Ages, labored chiefly for the glory of religion, has left inside the portal itself a kneeling statue, a life-like image of himself. The face is turned toward the high altar, and the tomb of St. James, which lies in the crypt immediately beneath the altar. With his right hand he strikes his breast, and in his left is a scroll with the simple words *Matthæus Architectus*.

Thus was fulfilled the wish of Pope Calixtus II. The temple which he had seen thronged to overflowing with the pilgrims who flocked to Compostella from every land in Christendom, had arisen from its ruins enlarged, beautified, a joy and a wonder to Spaniard and foreigner alike.

The innumerable hordes which crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in 1189 to 1195 under the command of the Moorish Caliph Al-Manssour, never invaded Galicia. Not till 1589, when the English fleet under Drake, after the destruction of the Armada, appeared on the coast of Northern Spain, was the shrine of St. James threatened with desecration or destruction. The English under Essex had filled Cadiz and the neighboring seaboard with dismay and horror, sacking, destroying, desecrating all that was holy. No Mohammedans could have surpassed these hordes in their work of devastation.

There was universal alarm in Compostella, Galicia, and the Asturias when Drake appeared off Corunna. The then Archbishop of Santiago, Don Juan de San Clemente at once sent away into the interior the precious relics contained in his cathedral, as well as such of the gold and silver ornaments as would tempt the cupidity of the invaders. The pious prelate took on himself alone, with the aid perhaps of some one of his clergy, whom he could trust as himself, to place the bodies of St. James and his two disciples where Drake and his men could not find them or would not seek for them. The archbishop performed his task by night and in the profoundest secrecy. The prevailing terror urged him to use all haste. Then it was that the report went abroad in Compostella and spread throughout Spain, that the archbishop and his attendants, when they approached the tomb of the Apostle, were driven back by a fierce light which radiated from the shrine. At any rate he was reported to have said to those who questioned him on the night's proceedings "that the great Apostle would know how to protect his shrine from the sacrilegious hands of his enemies."

As the days passed and no English made their appearance, the archbishop summoned the most skilled masons he could find, obliterated the entrance to the tomb from the upper Basilica, after having walled up every avenue of approach to it in the crypt itself. The real secret of what the prelate had done amid the terror and haste of his midnight work in the shrine, died with him. Both clergy and people continued to believe that St. James and his disciples reposed, undisturbed in the holy cave and the Gallo-Roman sarcophagus of the pious Gaelic convert, the Lady Lupa. Nor were they substantially wrong in this, as we shall now see.

Since that month of alarm in 1589, no person, priest or layman, king or cardinal, was ever allowed, or ever ventured to approach and to see the crypt with its triple tomb. When Cardinal Paya, now Archbishop of Toledo, became, in January, 1874, Archbishop of Compostella, he formed the determination of doing for the body of St. James what has been effected in our days for the bodies of St. Francis of Assisi, St. Claire, Sts. Philip and James the younger, as well as St. Ambrose and St. Charles Borromeo,—namely, of re-opening solemnly their tombs, of verifying and attesting the condition of their hallowed remains.

An opportunity for this verification was afforded in Compostella by the ruinous state of certain portions of the cathedral around the high altar. The Cardinal-archbishop appointed a commission of eminent and enlightened clergymen and no less eminent physicians and scientists, who followed every step in the proceedings, recorded and signed them day by day.

It was known, from the annals of the Basilica, that the altar-tomb of the Apostle was placed exactly in the crypt beneath the high altar in the church above. An opening was, therefore, made in front of the high altar and the commissioners descended into the crypt at the foot of the Gallo-Roman sepulchre. This and the two adjoining tombs of St. Theodore and St. Athanasius, were found empty! Nay so much of the Gallo-Roman sarcophagus donated by Lupa, as could be, in a moment of extreme haste, taken away with the relics, had been removed with these.

The commission ordered every part of the adjoining ground to be searched to a depth of five or six feet. At length behind the Roman tomb itself, and in the very centre of the apse, workmen came upon a rudely constructed grave marked with a cross, and made up of the bricks and fragments of marble taken from the Gallo-Roman sepulchre. The hardened plaster which covered the fragments bore the impress of a hand in more than one place.

It was, manifestly, the work of some one who, urged on by some mortal fear, amid the darkness, and in secret, had been thus burying away some cherished treasure. Everything there was eloquent

of the hurried labor of love performed by the aged Archbishop San Clemente. They opened this rudely constructed grave, and only found a confused heap of human bones, without paper or inscription of any kind enabling the discoverers to say to whom these relics belonged.

Then began the scrupulously conscientious work of the physicians and scientists belonging to the commission. Every fragment in the heap was carefully set apart and sorted. After the most minute examination, it was ascertained that the fragments belonged to three skeletons of the male sex, one of them being somewhat older than the others, and offering several stains or marks not found on the corresponding pieces belonging to the other two. The skull of this older skeleton, which bore these peculiar stains and other distinctive characteristics,—was also incomplete. The mastoid bone was missing.

Now it so happened that Archbishop Gelmirez, who occupied the See of Compostella from July, 1100, to 1140, had sent to the Bishop and Chapter of Pistoia, in Italy, this very same missing portion of the skull of St. James; and in the course of the further investigation ordered in 1884 by Leo XIII., the Papal Commissioner, Monsignor Agostino Caprara, found on the portion of the skull still revered in the Cathedral of Pistoia, the characteristic stains and marks which distinguish the corresponding part of the older cranium in Compostella.¹

Cardinal Paya adhered rigorously to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent in investigations of this important nature. Having arrived, as well as the commissioners, at the conclusion that the three skeletons discovered, as we have just related, belonged to St. James the Elder and his two disciples, an authentic copy of the proceedings and conclusions was forwarded to the Sacred Congregation of Rites and laid before the Pope. His Holiness forthwith named a special committee of seven cardinals to examine and report on the matter. On May 20, 1884, the cardinals reported that several points mentioned in the Compostella investigation should be sifted more thoroughly. Thereupon Mgr. Agostino Caprara was directed to proceed at once to Spain as Special Commissioner of His Holiness, and to probe to the bottom every tittle of the evidence furnished by Cardinal Paya. The Papal Commissioners, says Leo XIII., in his bull, "having taken the sworn testimony of the witnesses summoned by him; having rec-

¹ The letter of Archbishop Gelmirez, copied from the original kept in the archives of the Cathedral of Compostella, is given by Don Zepedano at page 26 of his work. Superficial critics have no idea of the solid ground on which Leo XIII. and his cardinals advanced in every step which led to the publication of the Bull *Deus Omnipotens*.

onciled some apparent contradictions in their former testimony; having examined at Compostella and Madrid the professional experts in archæology, history, and anatomy, competent to decide on the matters inquired into; having carefully inspected the remaining parts of the more ancient (Gallo-Roman) sarcophagus, and compared them with the materials of the tomb which contained the discovered relics, as well as surveyed the part of the apse in which these were found; and, finally, having once more questioned the skilled anatomists regarding every portion of the venerated skeletons, the commissioner returned to Rome, and completed his labors by an accurate report of all that he had done.

"Wherefore, having once more called together in the Vatican the same Committee of Cardinals on the 19th July of the present year (1884), and a thorough discussion of every doubtful point resulting in a clearer manifestation of the truth, the question was put: 'Shall the judgment pronounced by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Compostella, regarding the identity of the relics discovered in the centre of the apse of the principal sanctuary of the said Metropolitan Basilica, and judged to belong to the Apostle James the Elder and to his two disciples, Athanasius and Theodore, be now confirmed . . . ?'

"And our Beloved Sons, the Cardinals aforesaid, together with the Prelates Consultors, considering that all the questions submitted to them were verified beyond the possibility of contradiction, and that, therefore, they had arrived at that certain knowledge of the subject-matter which, in conformity with the sacred canons and the constitutions of our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, is to be sought for in such inquiries, thus made answer: "*Affirmative, sen sententiam esse confirmandam.*"¹

Leo XIII., in order to revive throughout Christendom the ancient piety of our forefathers toward the shrine of St. James in Compostella, not only made of the year 1885 a jubilee year in Spain for all who visited the tomb of the Apostle, but extended to every diocese in the Catholic world the privilege of sharing the spiritual favors bestowed on pilgrims to Compostella.

Ever since the 25th of July, 1179, in virtue of a bull of Alexander III., it is a jubilee year in Compostella when the 25th of July, the feast of St. James, falls on Sunday. This happened in 1886, and will again happen only in 1897 within the present century. In the next century these jubilee years will be: 1909, 1915, 1920, 1926, 1937, 1943, 1948, 1954, 1965, 1971, 1976, 1982, 1993, 1999.

¹ Leonis XIII. . . . *Acta*, vol. iv., pp. 159-172.

This favor was conferred by Pope Calixtus II., and was confirmed by Eugene III., Anastasius IV., and Alexander III. Happy those among our readers whose age will permit them to look forward beyond the limits of the present century to the enjoyment of long years in the next. Thrice happy should devotion lead them to the ancient land of the Gael and the favored shrine of St. James on some future jubilee year. They will find in the "Field of the Star" and its inhabitants still living, ardent and bright with the light of other days, that faith which led Bishop Theodomir and Alfonso-the-Chaste to the blessed cave in the hillside of Libredon. Should our pilgrims boast of the old Celtic blood which warms the heart of the writer, they will remember, on crossing the waters of the deep Ulla, and climbing the steep iron pathway that leads thence to the *Campus Stellæ*, that among the first to whom St. James brought the Gospel truth in Spain, were those Gaels of the Asturias, and that it was a noble woman of that race who granted to the disciples of the martyred Apostle a resting-place in her own family sepulchre.

BERNARD O'REILLY.

¹ The inscription on the marble sarcophagus in which repose once more, since 1884, the relics of St. James, is as follows :

D. M. S.
ATIANO. ET.AT
TE.T LVMPA.
VIRIA EMO
NEPTIS PIANO. XVI.
ET S. F. C.

SOME AMERICAN NOVELS.¹

WHEN the American novelist writes about his art he takes himself very seriously. And he should; for the novel has become the most powerful literary factor in our civilization. Nobody attempts to teach through the theatre. With us the theatre is a place of amusement—nothing more. Our essayists are very charming, very exquisite, but they produce only light filagree work. Take the latest essays of Colonel Higginson and Miss Repplier, and they have made English prose almost as clear, as plastic, as perfect as that of the French, and you have all manner of delightful pleasantries; they make literature; they are simpler than Addison and more witty than Steele, and their style fits their subjects like a glove; but one longs for even the air of intensity, which is so characteristically Emersonian: for the solid things one must go back to Bacon and Montaigne.

The novel has come to be the most serious expression of the literature of the nineteenth century. Nobody writes sermons now except to deliver them—which is a pity. We have become such slaves of the types that we must verify everything we hear, and a sermon loses a large part of its force by not appearing in print.

Wiseman and Newman were quick to see the mission of the novel; and to-day Miss Austen need not have made a defense of it. It is no longer "light"—but how could Samuel Richardson or Miss Burney ever have been considered "light?"—no longer a tale of sentiment to be apologized for. Win. D. Howells, or Mr. Crawford, or Mr. Thomas Hardy, or Mr. Richard Blackmore, write of the modern novel as Miss Austen wrote in the incomparable "Northanger Abbey."

"Although," she writes, "our productions have afforded more extensive and unaffected pleasure than any other literary compositions in the world, no species of composition has been so much decried. From pride, ignorance or fashion, our foes are almost as many as our readers; and, while the abilities of the nine-hundredth abridger of the "History of England," or of the man who collects and publishes in a volume some dozen lines of Milton, Pope or Prior, with a paper from the *Spectator*, and a chapter from Sterne, are eulogized by a thousand pens, there seems almost a general wish to decry the capacity and undervalue the labor of the

¹ *Saracenesca, Sant' Ilario*, etc., by F. Marion Crawford: Macmillan & Co., New York.

novelist, and to slight the performances which have only genius, wit and taste to recommend them." "A good novel is only some work in which the greatest powers of the mind are displayed, in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineations of its varieties, the liveliest effusions of wit and humor are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language."

It must be admitted that the English novelists do not take themselves as seriously as the Americans. They are less self-conscious, but more self-satisfied. They do not seem to bother as to whether they are idealists or novelists. One of them, Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson, takes the lowest view of his art, though he is the most artistic of them all. Messrs. Howells and James are French rather than English in their ideas of their art—ethical disciples of Flaubert rather than of Thackeray. But their realism—thank God! has nothing in common with the naturalism of the French school of novelists. Mr. Howells, whose practise of his art is much greater than his theories, would teach and photograph; Mr. James would dissect and etch; Mr. Marion Crawford paints without seeming to trouble himself about methods or schools. Neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James has the great manner of Mr. Crawford; but they are incapable of such uneven work. Their brush-marks may sometimes be slight, and they may seem to have no conceptions worthy of any brush-work at all, but it is all even, smooth, technically good. Mr. Howells has never written anything very bad, nor has Mr. James. Mr. Crawford has written the best novel ever produced by an American, and the worst. The one is "*Saracenesca*," the other "*An American Politician*."

Mr. Crawford has violent admirers and violent detractors. By some he is exalted, by others depressed. But the worst thing about him is that he writes too much. Again, one may say that the fact that he writes so much shows that his admirers are many and clamorous for more. But, although the taste of the elect and that of the public always join in acclaiming the right thing when time has mellowed it, he who considers the crowds first loses their suffrages in the end.

It is not pardonable to say much, without his permission, about the life of a man still in the flesh. It is enough to say that he was born at the Baths of Lucca, in 1854; that he is the son of Thomas Crawford, the sculptor, and the nephew of Julia Ward Howe; that he was trained with care, and at Cambridge, Heidelberg and the University of Rome pursued special studies with great zeal; that, returning to America, he took a course of Sanscrit and Greek. He had attempted newspaper work in India, and contributed papers on philosophies of various kinds to the reviews, when, having told some glowing Oriental tales to his uncle,

Mr. Samuel Ward, that gentleman—whose good taste in all things became an American proverb before he died—suggested to Mr. Crawford that he ought to write a novel. In "The Three Fates," which is Mr. Crawford's latest novel but one, he tells us of the experiences of a young man of letters in New York. How much of this is his own experience, who can tell? Novelists mix things so. When they seem to be most realistic, they are often most idealistic. They will no more stick to a cut-and-dry plot or to their own experiences than Euripides or Sophocles would have stuck to the classic and iron-clad rules which the great Aristotle formulated. Have we not been made to believe, of late, that Horace Skimpole was not Leigh Hunt, after all? That Anthony Trollope knew nothing of the lives of English clergymen, in spite of "Barchester Towers" and "The Warden;" that Miss Fotheringay was not the actress Miss O'Neil, and that Thackeray evolved the delicious "De Floracs" from his inner consciousness? And so, it is hard to tell how far the experience of George Wood in "The Three Fates" is from life. At any rate, it is the experience of many honorable and well-educated young men who feel an impulse towards the pursuit of literature. Mr. Crawford's hero begins by reviewing books at the rate of half a cent a word. He does it energetically and earns his money. He is affected with the delusion of young newspaper writers that the contributor, or even the editor, controls the policy of the paper without regard to the business department. George Wood learns by sad experience—the reduction of his revenue—that the book reviser on a daily paper must adapt himself to more tastes than one. And from this young gentleman's revelation about modern journalism, one may conclude that the Catholic writer or reporter on a great daily paper has no more power to express his real sentiments, when the policy of the paper is against them, than a fly has on the circulation of a wheel. He has his choice—to remain powerless or to drop off. Doyle, the admirable contributor to *Punch*, did the latter when the policy of that paper became seriously anti-Papal; and Freeman, the late historian, followed his example when the *Saturday Review* undertook to support the English policy of helping the unspeakable Turk. A Catholic who undertakes book reviews must accept the policy of his paper, and whether Huxley's latest views or Daudet's last novel, or a reprint of Schopenhauer be under discussion, he must take the cue from his editor, or resign. It is appropriate here to remark that the man who owns the largest share in the newspaper is the man that controls its policy; it is a question of money—and, so long as it is a question of money, the hope—indulged in by the inexperienced—that the professedly Catholic paper will soon no longer be a necessity, is fallacious.

"The Three Fates," is not after Marion Crawford's strongest manner. The style is not up to the perfection of much of his writing. It has the quality of nature, human interest. George Wood discovers that newspaper criticism is not his vocation. He finds this out in a characteristically American way. Original work pays better, and henceforth Mr. George Wood resolves that he will no longer be a critic, for he was born to be criticized. There is truth in Mr. Crawford's picture of the life of the young college-bred man of letters in New York. The disgust of the hero's father, who has failed irretrievably in business, when he finds that his son will obey his impulse to write, is well done, and the effects of this impulse on the son's life are equally well described. Mr. Crawford must have felt it; the dogged determination of this man who does not mistake the desire to write, for the gift of expression has never been better described. George Wood works on, discouraged, faltering, but persevering until he finds his *métier*, which is novel-writing. In no other city is talent and energy of any sort more quickly recognized than in New York, and George Wood's success after he has written his first book contains no element of exaggeration in it. There are some graphic passages on the difference between the newspaper man and the literary man. The editor—especially the night editor—is *sui generis*, and there is nothing in common between him and the man of letters, pure and simple. The editor, as Mr. Crawford hints, may be a man of letters, but he is a man of letters out of his element, and with a new set of very unliterary faculties developed. Mr. Crawford's presentment of the hardships of the young reviewer, who wants to be bold and honest according to his lights, is very realistic. It is not quite fair, however, to say that all books must be reviewed in a daily journal with an eye to the advertisement column.

The sentimental part of "The Three Fates" is not entirely satisfactory. Everybody familiar with social New York will recognize how true are Mr. Crawford's types. Constance, whom one respects in the beginning, is a disappointment. Mamie is well-drawn,—in fact, she is too well-drawn to be pleasant,—and Grace is rather too greatly over-weighted with common sense to be interesting. These are the three fates, and yet the novel cannot be said to have a heroine. It is one of the few books by Mr. Crawford which one reads a second time with more pleasure than the first, in spite of the rather coarse outlines of Mamie's mother, who is a rather underbred woman of society, realistically presented without any fuss about realism.

Mr. Crawford understands and loves best Italy. He has elected to live at Sorrento, and, as he is now a Catholic, the one barrier which prevented Robert Browning and so many other men of

genius from getting near to the Italians and the meaning of Italian history and social life, has been removed. He is cosmopolitan, as he ought to be, with such an education and such wide experiences and tastes; and he is versatile. But he satisfies our heart and intellect most when he takes us to the land of the orange and myrtle. His Italy is very different from the Italy of "The Marble Faun." There we have New Englandism in an Italian environment; there is no touch of the doctrinaire,—of Madame de Stael's philosophizing in it. Nor is it the rococco Italy of that more recent book, Mr. Fuller's "Chevalier Pensieri-Vani." One feels that it is the real thing, and that one is safe in Mr. Crawford's hands. When Mr. Crawford leads us into his own country or into England, one does not feel so safe. If he ever writes a novel of English society, it will have a touch of D'Israeli, and we shall revel in tinsel and diamonds and eat with abnormally stately duchesses off gold plate. This love of splendor and the terribly romantic does not hamper him in the country of Saracenesca, of Marzio, of Nino, and, besides, every now and then he finds a vent for his impulses in romances which neither shock our tastes nor our sense of the probable. In "Paul Patoff" he lays his scene in Constantinople. Now anything may happen in Constantinople. It is hard to believe that a mother can hate her son so desperately as to try to kill him twice. An unnatural hate, like that, cannot be treated successfully even by the highest genius. Who, for instance, does not feel that Shakespeare's Regan and Goneril come as near to being failures as any characters from his hand could be? Mr. Crawford makes us forget the repulsiveness of his study of a mother's hatred by the splendor of his descriptions of Turkish life, and indulges his tastes for adventures of the "Arabian Nights'" kind to his heart's content. We never think of blaming him for improbabilities, and we must admit his wonderful power as a narrator; but when he makes the abnormal repulsive simply because he does not sufficiently think his story out before he plunges into it, we do begin to blame him. This fault, however, is the result of quick production. It shows worst in "The Witch of Prague," where, too, we find a phrase or two which sound unorthodox.

In "Zoroaster" he again sets fire to his oriental torch, and it blazes away magnificently. Mr. Crawford calls "Zoroaster" a drama, and dedicates it to his wife. It would indeed make a telling drama, but no stage setting could supply the place of the jewelled and luxurious yet simple style of this book. As in "A Roman Singer," he touches a perfection of style which he finally reaches in his "With the Immortals." In considering the rather commonplace and certainly careless manner of "The Three Fates," and the coarse verbiage of "An American Politician," one finds it difficult

to believe that Mr. Crawford did not trust the verbal part of the two latter entirely to his typewriter. His touch is firm, and his color glowing in "Zoroaster." It is the outcome of those Oriental studies in which he has taken so much interest. Few men have written such rhythmical prose as we find in this book. The figure of Daniel the Prophet is a very noble one, and the bursts of Persian lyrics in it not unworthy of a book which needed only a more pronounced poetical form to be ranked almost epically high. Another dip into the most iris-hued wave of romance is "Khaled," a short Arabian tale of one of the genii who could only obtain a soul when the woman for whom he left "his place in the third Heaven of precious stones" should learn to love him. One of Mr. Crawford's characteristic touches is where, after Khaled has gained a soul, he faces the mob that had burst into the palace. "If any man wishes to take my life," he cried, "let him come and take it. And the sword they all knew in battle began to make a storm of lightning about his head in the morning sun." It has been often said that no experience is useless to a man; it has proved so in Mr. Crawford's case. He is not yet forty years of age. "Mr. Isaacs," his first novel, appeared in 1882, and he has touched on many subjects with a versatility which is not without defects, but which shows no weakness. The worst that can be said of him so far is that he is not equal to himself.

It is easy to understand why "Mr. Isaacs" became popular. It had an air of real experience; it possessed that new flavor which both the novel-reader and the talker about literature eagerly welcome; its style was easy, graceful, modulated, clear, and though the author had not much of a story to tell, his manner of telling in modern daylight of wonders that are supposed to be only proper to weird and mysterious surroundings, was very fascinating. Besides, the new "fad" of theosophy had begun to attract attention. The American who had not found Positivism or the hot-water cure or the blue-glass mania satisfactory, was delighted to learn more about the "astral body" and the Buddhist adepts. The hero of the book, Mr. Isaacs, is a well-known Indian dealer in jewels, whose lawsuit this year with a native prince has recently excited much attention in the English press.

Mr. Crawford knew very well that, in introducing the mysterious Mr. Isaacs to Americans, he had them at his mercy, and he took advantage of it. A romancer is not obliged to explain anything; he describes phenomena—that is all. When Ram Dal, the interesting Buddhist adept, disappears suddenly from the room, presumably going through the wall, Mr. Isaacs and his friend coolly take their sherbert and smoke their pipes, and give the impression that the adept in India frequently goes out in that manner.

"We live," says Mr. Isaacs, "in a land where marvels are common enough. Who has explained the basket trick, or the mango trick, or the man who throws a rope up into the air and then climbs up it, and takes the rope after him, disappearing into blue space? And yet you have seen those things—I have seen them, everyone has seen them—and the performers claim no supernatural agency or assistance. It is merely a difference of degrees, whether you make a mango grow from the seed to the tree in half an hour, or whether you transport yourself ten thousand miles in as many seconds, possibly through walls of brick and stone, on your way astonishing some ordinary mortal by showing that you know all about his affairs."

Mr. Isaacs explains that the Buddhist adepts, who deny that they have either the special help of God or of the devil, in their "phenomena," propose to obtain happiness by means of wisdom, which is a knowledge of the world in the broadest sense of the phrase; this knowledge they hope to get by reading finite results through "a clever use of the infinite."

One is reminded of the subdivisions of the winds and their colors in the old Brehon laws—where the south wind, by the way, was purple—by the statement Mr. Isaacs makes of the subtle division the Buddhists make of sound, which they invariably connect with shades of colors in the rainbow; they believe that the bond between the body and the soul can be so attenuated by asceticism that the soul can be free to roam where it pleases. It would seem, after all, that the Buddhist is quite willing to be annihilated after he has once satisfied his curiosity about everything. This is rather a low ideal, after all, in spite of the high-sounding claims of the Theosophists. But Mr. Crawford does not teach; he simply strives to be interesting and amusing; one cannot help imagining how D'Israeli would have revelled in his hero, and in the mock-supernaturalism of Theosophy. Mr. Crawford has D'Israeli's love of splendor, but he shows no second-hand "goods," and his diamonds are all real.

Mr. Crawford has avoided those subjects which make Mr. Mallock's attempts to write fiction so nasty. Only in "To Leeward" has he made the motive of many of the novels of our cousins, the French, the principal factor in a story. There we have a study of a young woman—a very modern young woman—who reads Kant, and struggles with Kant's statement, that "Nothing is the same as Being." She has been badly brought up, but she is not actively bad; she is "odd," she begins by being very strong-minded, and ends by being very weak-minded. She marries the Marchese Marcantonio, who is one of those Roman aristocrats, effete, noble, melancholy, slow, whom Mr. Crawford delights in.

In fact, Mr. Crawford is most at home in an artificial society. If he ever lays the scene of a novel in the Faubourg St. Germain, it will have the grand air of Octave Feuillet, and the rarefied atmosphere of Mrs. Craven. Diana, Marcantonio's sister, is a fine type of the great lady—one can see that religious principle lies behind the best qualities of her thought and conduct—pure, high-minded, full of self-respect, and yet not haughty.

“Daughter of the gods, divinely fair, and most divinely tall.”

Julius Batiscombe, the novelist, is a despicable creature, whose aim in life is to make women love him—by a pretence of love on his part. Mr. Crawford treats him too gently. He is a cad; but he succeeds in eloping with Marcantonio's wife, who becomes contemptibly frivolous, and whose death, while she is screening her lover from the pistol-ball of her husband, does not even give her dignity. We perceive that she is a weak person, who needed all the safeguards of the Catholic Church to save her from her own lightness of character, but who fails for lack of strong religious support. Mr. Crawford probably intended to teach a moral; but if it be not this it is invisible. This heroine had no reason to exist in fiction, for she is no better than the thistle-down heroines of “Frou-Frou” and “Le Sphinx”—stagnant creatures, with no human element in them, except the distorted opinion that temptation implies the doctrine of non-resistance. Nevertheless, there are clever passages in the book; and in it we find the germ of “Saracenesca”; for, Corona is after all, Diana carefully thought out. A half-dozen essayists could set up a reputation for brilliancy on the bits of wisdom and wit which Mr. Crawford flings off with that ease which is so lacking in the other maker of epigrams, Mr. George Meredith, now the reigning favorite in circles of culture. Crawford is seldom really humorous; sometimes his wit has a touch of flippancy which does not improve it. “Surely,” he says, describing the ball in “To Leeward,” “without a waltz the world would have lacked a very divine element. Few people can really doubt what the step was that David danced before the ark.” This is an appeal to the gallery with a vengeance. The special manner of his clever phrases is well shown in this: “The people who can help others, are the strong ones who can catch them just below the shoulder by the arm and support them and push them to land, themselves doing all the work. That is a watery simile, but most similes are but water, and can be poured into a tea-cup or into a bucket—they will take the shape of either.”

In “Dr. Claudius” we breathe pure air once again. Claudius is a fine fellow, with all the tenderness and truth of the North;

and the Countess Margaret is one of those noble women who do not do anything great, but seem capable of all greatness. In these Mr. Crawford delights. The scene opens in Heidelberg, which, he says, is a place of little learning. Here we find the prelude to his later and greater novel of "Greiffenstein." There are Americans in this novel, and there is a very affectionate and reverential picture of the author's uncle, Mr. Samuel Ward, "as the uncle of all the world." The Duke and his sister, the Lady Victoria, are exceedingly pleasant people. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is credited with having said that Queen Victoria might without doubt be admitted to any family circle in America. One may say the same thing of Mr. Crawford's aristocrats and prelates; usually, in novels, they are people that no respectable American would care to know, however well conducted they may be in real life. What a relief it is to find a Cardinal in a novel who is without designs on the virtuous Protestant! Ever since Webster wrote his lugubrious "Dutchess of Malfi," Cardinals on the English stage, and in the English novels, have, as a rule, not been presentable to decent society. Fortunately, the English-reading public has had every reason in the last few years to get over its prejudice against the prelate of Webster, Browning, and even Bulwer. How delightful, then, was it to meet something like the real men in "Marzio's Crucifix" and "Saracenesca." We had not had such Cardinals in fiction since the great Borromeo was limned in "The Betrothed," by Manzoni. The Americans in "Dr. Claudius" are Americans seen from the outside, except in "The Three Fates"—and, even there, there is a suspicion of it. Mr. Crawford looks at America and Americans from the outside. Mr. Barker, for instance, is photographed, but nothing more; he had a good social position in New York, his photographer says, for "although he was not Dutch, he had been born in Salem, Massachusetts." In "Dr. Claudius" we begin to notice a peculiarity about his heroine's eyes which grows on him until, in his latest novel, "Don Orsino,"—now running in the *Atlantic Monthly*—he dares to expect us to admire a prima donna who has yellow eyes, with a squint; and he coolly tells us that "Orsino fancied that one eye or the other wandered a very little, but he could not tell which; the slightest obliquity made the glance disquieting and yet attractive." Margaret, in "Dr. Claudius," has eyes of "burning amber." But there is one redeeming trait, which neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James has, and which Mr. Crawford possesses—he is always in love with his heroines, and "all the world loves a lover." His analyses of love are manly; and there is a picture of the modern young man, and his attitude towards pure affection, on page 26 of "Dr. Claudius," which is very nobly done. "Englishmen," he says, "are rarely heroic lovers, except

in their novels. There is generally a little by-path of caution, a postern-gate of mercantile foresight, by which they can slip quietly out at the right moment and forget all about the whole thing." "No man, living or dead, has ever understood any woman for five minutes at a time." "There is a tone in some voices," he says, "which seems to have a power of perpetuating itself and rebounding among the alcoves of our recollections. Rarely, very rarely, singers possess it, and even though their powers be limited, there comes a strange thrill into their singing which fixes it indelibly on the memory."

For delightful bits about music and singing, one must go to "*A Roman Singer*," the most artistic, the most quaint of all Marion Crawford's novels, and the most sympathetic as well. "One cannot argue with singers," says the charming old professor who tells the story of his ward, Nino, in the most characteristic phrases. Like all Mr. Crawford's heroes, Nino is honest, pure-minded and straightforward. His love for the Baroness von Lira is like that of Orlando for Rosalind—very sudden and equally idyllic. The charm of the novel lies in the character of the old professor, and it reads like an interpretation by Mr. Crawford of a simple document, written in a dialect which is not quite the language of Dante or Selvio Pellico; not, in fact, the literary language of the Italians. It is steeped in local color; it is racy of the Roman soil, and of the narrow, shrewd, kindly and artistic type—the Roman bourgeois who had been a noble, but whose life is now bounded by pretty economies of oil and olives and fowl, that he may have syrup of violets occasionally with his dear ward, Nino, and his own wine from the little vineyard he has bought with his savings. "I was fond of my old self, but I did not respect him much. And my present self I respect without fondness. Is that metaphysics? Who knows? It is vanity, in either case, and the vanity of self-respect is perhaps a more dangerous thing than the vanity of self-love, though you may call it pride, perhaps, or give it any other high-sounding title. But the heart of a vain man is lighter than the heart of the proud."

"*A Roman Singer*" is idyllic, poetical, and a masterpiece of simplicity. In these Italian novels, or romances—for Mr. Crawford belongs to the romantic school—he redeems Americans abroad from the charge of stupidity and ignorance which Hawthorne's "*Marble Faun*" brought upon them. Who, with a heart and taste, does not admire Hawthorne's exquisite romance? But what Catholic can control his indignation at some of the grotesque misunderstandings and misstatements in that book? There is a bit of exaggeration in the first chapter of "*A Roman Singer*," where Nino, at the benediction, bows—not towards the

tabernacle, but to the Baroness von Lira, whom he has just met. It shocks the reverent.

There is an element of romantic simplicity in Crawford's better novels—especially in "*A Roman Singer*"—that reminds one of the methods of Shakespeare's comedies. The best of our modern novels are lineal descendants from Shakespeare and the romantic dramatists of the Elizabethan epoch. The novel is as much the literary expression of our time as the drama was that of the Elizabethan; and to lessons learned so well from Shakespeare, we owe the present perfection of the novel. The admirers of De Balzac have made a fetich of him; but our one American, who has been more influenced by him than by Shakespeare, has surpassed him. If one compares "*César Berotteau*" with "*Silas Lapham*," or "*Eugenie Grandet*" with "*The Quality of Mercy*," we shall be forced to find that, in spite of literary superstition, Mr. Howells' realism is more sane and healthy than that of the Frenchman, and his talent not less powerful.

But Mr. Crawford is romantic—not realistic; and that may be one reason why some of our literary high priests, whose deities are Tolstoi and Ibsen, look coldly on him. In "*Marzio's Crucifix*," which is not so quaint or idyllic as "*A Roman Singer*," but which is as true to nature as the colors of the Japanese or the notes of birds are true, Mr. Crawford makes a careful study of two elements on which the future of Europe depends. Marzio is at once an artist and an anarchist, and we have a masterly analysis of the anarchistic point of view, and also of the Roman popular point of view. Again, one feels safe in Mr. Crawford's hands. He is not likely to put foolish opinions into the mouths of Catholics merely for the sake of effect; he knows too much for that. The Cardinal, for instance, talks and acts with a dignity of his position; he possesses what Matthew Arnold would call "lucidity." The good priest, Don Paolo, has all the good qualities and naturalness of Manzoni's¹ curate, without his cowardice; and the love story which runs through the book is very pure and honest. The Romans, Mr. Crawford says, reverence a Cardinal, no matter whether they be affected with the superstitious worship of Italy or not, and they look on the Florentine and the Piedmontese as foreigners. Marzio, a type of the Continental free-thinker, reasons about the murder of his brother, Don Paolo, whom he hates:

"Since there was no soul," he thought, "there was no absolute right or wrong, and everything must be decided by the standard of expediency. It was a mistake to allow people to murder one another openly, of course, because people of less intellectual

¹ I Promessi Sposi.

capacity would take upon themselves to judge such cases in their own way. But provided that public morality, the darling of the free-thinker, was not scandalized, there would be no inherent wrong in doing away with Paolo. On the contrary, his death would be a benefit to the community at large (since he was a priest), and be an advantage to Marzio in particular. Not a pecuniary advantage, either, for in Marzio's strange system there would have been an immorality in murdering Paolo for his money, if he had ever had any, though it seemed right enough to kill him for an idea. This is, to a great extent, the code of those persons who believe in nothing but what they call great ideas. The individuals who murdered the Czar would doubtless have scrupled to rob a gentleman in the street of ten francs. Marzio said to himself that to get rid of Paolo would be to emancipate himself and his family from the rule and interference of a priest, and that such a proceeding was only the illustration, on a small scale, of what he desired for his country; consequently, it was just, and therefore it ought to be done."

No comment is necessary; Marzio is a type, and Mr. Crawford has logically followed the reasoning of the type which acknowledges neither God nor master, and which adores ideas. The conversation between the Cardinal and Don Paolo, where the priest fears that the lovely chalices and crucifixes carved by his infidel brother may be unfit for the service of the Church, is characteristic and true. "Their use sanctifies them," the Cardinal says, "not the moral goodness of the artist. For, by your own argument, you would otherwise be committing a sin if we did not find out the most saintly men and set them to silver-chiselling instead of consecrating them bishops and archbishops. It would take a long time to build a church if you only employed masons who were in the state of grace."

The conversion of Marzio, through his masterpiece, the crucifix, is rather sudden—almost as sudden as the change in Orlando's brother, in "As You Like It." But, as Marzio himself says, perhaps it was a miracle.

It would take too much space to analyze "Greiffenstein" adequately. It is not so vivid or so strong as "Saracenesca;" the characters do not grip us so firmly, but it is an important contribution to literature; and from it one gets a clear idea of where the strength of the German social body lies. In it Mr. Crawford makes thorough use of his experience in the German universities.

"With the Immortals" is a fantasy. It reminds one both of Mallock's "New Republic" and of Walter Savage Landor's "Imaginary Conversations." In style it equals both. It has the grace and "modernity" of Mallock, and the learning, without the

perversity, of Landor. It is a masterpiece of English, and almost French in the perfection of its form. It is a fantasia of grace, and cleverness and brilliancy. One may pick it up at any time and find a thought which suggests much; or, perhaps, something that will irritate one's mind, as the little foreign substance irritates the oyster and produces a pearl. This series of conversations with Henry of Navarre, Cromwell, Julius Cæsar, Dr. Johnson—and many others of the elder men brought back to life—has given the author his real place in literature; for "With the Immortals," judged by every rule, *is* literature.

"Saracenesca," "Sant Ilario" and "Don Orsino" go together. Don Orsino is the son of Saracenesca and Corona, the noblest of Mr. Crawford's heroines. "The Witch of Prague" and a "Cigarette Maker's Romance" are studies in mental peculiarities. The former is a sensational, hypnotic phantasmagoria, without any human interest, and as terrible and as brutally dramatic as Webster's "Duchess of Malfi." "A Cigarette Maker's Romance" is sane and interesting. "A Tale of a Country Parish" is a slight story brilliantly told, but which there was no special reason to tell.

"Saracenesca" is a great novel, and the author of it need only be equal to himself to be the greatest of American novelists. Mr. W. E. Norris, the English novelist, has been compared to Thackeray, but Mr. Crawford has more power and a broader range than Mr. Norris. Space again prevents an analysis of "Saracenesca." It is a picture of phases of life which have never been truly painted before, because there was no painter worthy of the work. The Italian would have been prejudiced or influenced by the French naturalistic school or his politics; another foreigner would not have understood it. But Mr. Crawford has understood; he has followed the instincts of genius and the promptings of reason. . He shows Rome as it was just before the spoliation. He is not a special pleader, but a sound artist; an artist who can think, and whose colors are laid on with the firmness of intelligence. "Sant Ilario" lacks something of the grandeur and delicacy of "Saracenesca," of which it is a sequel; and we cannot judge of "Don Orsino" until it appears as a whole. The description of the Pope's jubilee in the first chapters shows that Mr. Crawford has not lost that grasp of details and of masses which make his descriptions of great functions splendid and unique.

One cannot predict what Mr. Marion Crawford may do. It is certain, however, that he has produced in "Saracenesca" one of the most satisfactory works of fiction in our language. It is unfortunate that his education and experience preclude him from painting American life with the truth and clearness of his Italian pictures.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

THE REGENTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

AT the request of the Most Rev. Editor of the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, the writer here attempts to place before the readers of the REVIEW a brief history of the Regent-system of the State of New York, and its relation to our Catholic Schools. He would gladly have left the subject to be treated by some one more competent to give to the public a comprehensive outline of this institution, and its bearings upon Catholic education. To understand its nature and scope we shall trace it from the broad stream of its present existence to the small rills of its early beginnings.

The University of the State of New York is an organization which, as it now stands, includes several of the incorporated colleges of the State, together with a number of incorporated academies, and academical public and private schools. The governing body of this university is a Board of Regents, composed in part of State officers, who are regents *ex officio*, and, in part, of members elected by the State legislature in the same manner that senators of the United States are elected. Their functions are those of supervision and inspection—not of instruction.

The original idea was supposed to be akin to that of the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which are composed of separate and independent colleges. The colleges under the regents, however, were not established in the same locality, but were distributed through the State, as circumstances seemed to call for them. Certain parts of this original plan proved impracticable, and many changes were introduced by subsequent legislatures. The original act creating the university was passed by the legislature May 1, 1784, at the close of the Revolutionary war. It was in response to a very strong appeal from Governor George Clinton, in his annual message. He saw the necessity of doing something for education. Private schools were languishing; the King's College had been broken up during the war and its property confiscated. The legislature promptly responded, and the Regents of the State of New York were incorporated as the governing body of King's College, which had been revived under the name of Columbia College, together with all other institutions of the kind which the regents might deem proper to establish.

Experience, however, very soon proved that a body constituted like this board, of men scattered over a sparsely settled State, could not be assembled for business except on very urgent occa-

sions. Three years later, an act was passed which substantially created the university as it now exists. It bears upon it the stamp of that great genius, Alexander Hamilton. His design was to include the whole system of education—primary, academic, and collegiate—under the regents, giving to it the strength and vigor which would result from local government under a strong, central supervisory department. If this idea had been carried out, the school question for Catholics might have been solved long ago, as denominational schools would have been admitted to their share of the public funds.

This bill authorized the regents to visit and inspect all colleges, academies, and schools, which were established, and which might be established in the State; to examine into the condition of education and discipline; and to make a yearly report thereof to the legislature. It empowered them to confer the highest scholastic degrees, to charter colleges and academies, and to grant collegiate charters to such academies as might grow to be worthy of them.

Besides the provisions relating to the university, the act ratified and confirmed the charter of Columbia College, named a board of trustees, and invested it with power to hold property, with all other rights and powers possessed under the charter of 1784. It thus laid down the principle, which has since been adhered to in the State of New York, that the university should include and have the inspection of all the colleges and academies of the State, but that each should have its own board of trustees, who should constitute a body corporate for the management of its individual affairs. The first meeting of this new board was held July the 19th, 1789, at the Exchange, in New York city. Governor Clinton was then chosen Chancellor. At this meeting, the first application was made by an academy in the State for a charter, which was granted in the following November. This institution still survives under the name of Erasmus Hall, Flatbush, and is a living memento of the first board of regents. The same year the Clinton Academy, Oneida county, received its charter. Then followed Union College, at Schenectady, in 1795.

Passing over, without mention, many years of inaction and routine work, we come nearer to our own times. In the year 1846, new powers were granted to the regents. By an act of the legislature they were made trustees of the State Library, and of the State Museum of Natural History. They were authorized, at their discretion, to confer the highest honorary degrees; to appoint boards of Medical Examiners, and, on their recommendation, to confer the degree of M.D. They held examinations, and granted certificates to legal studies. Their examinations also determined the standard of academic institutions throughout the State. They

were empowered to be the custodians of the historical documents of the State, and of certain legislative documents. This position they still hold. They maintain a duplicate department of important documents, and conduct the publication and distribution of State works of the highest scientific character: They have charge of the investigation of State boundaries, and the restoring of monuments along their lines. From all institutions subject to their visitations they require an annual report under oath; and, for sufficient cause, they may alter, amend, or repeal the charter of any institution incorporated according to the laws of the State of New York.

The university is not well known or fully understood, owing to the fact that, in its present condition, it is unlike our usually received idea of a university. It lacks the charms of local traditions and associations that cling to the universities of the Middle Ages. It has not its multitudes of students, drawn from all lands by the fame of celebrated teachers, and its clusters of venerable and historic buildings, standing in an atmosphere of repose, proud of their ancient traditions. We might find, however, in our State university some remote resemblance to the English and Continental universities, inasmuch as their various colleges, independent in their government, were united in a common life by means of their uniform examinations. What the London University does to-day for every young man who submits to its examinations, without requiring residence or attendance upon special lecture courses, is granted by our university to all the studious youth in the Empire State. For her highest degree she requires only success in her examinations. These examinations are thorough and severe, and a degree thus obtained is respected by the best educational institutions of the land. It is truly what President Gilman calls "a supervisory university with the crowning power of conferring degrees. A Chancellor is not the president of a body of teachers, but a chairman of a body of trustees." It has two important functions; one is the management of an immense system of academic administration, the other comprehends the duty of stimulating higher educational efforts. It acts upon the academies through its system of preliminary and academic examinations, making the distribution of State aid dependent upon conformity to the requirements of a rigid but reasonable examination. Its influence upon the colleges lies in the raised standard of preliminary and academic courses of studies, in this manner providing for the colleges a more advanced and riper class of pupils.

Thus we have, in the University of the State of New York, not indeed a few time-honored institutions, such as cluster around Oxford and Louvain, but colleges, academies, and schools which

number about four hundred, located in almost every county of the Empire State, doling out the blessings of a liberal education. Chancellor Pruyn, in his address of 1878 to the Convocation, said: "The University of the State of New York, though generally regarded as a legal fiction, is a truth of grand reality. The numerous institutions of which it is composed are not, as in England, crowded into a single city, but are scattered for popular convenience, over the entire State."

Another valuable feature of the system is the Convocation, in which the regents and officers of all the colleges, academies, and normal schools, within the State take part. In no other State is such an assembly to be found. In no other State, do teachers and officers of colleges and academies, irrespective of creed, meet annually to deliberate upon the condition and progress, the aims and principles, the spirit and methods, of secondary and higher education. The sessions are held in the month of July, during which time papers are read, experimental measures are discussed, degrees are conferred, and individual views exchanged.

To direct such a complex and all-important institution, the men known as the regents must be of the best and the highest intelligence; and, as a rule, such they are. They may not shine as brightly as the members of the French Academy, yet the national University of France has many points in common with the regents of the State of New York. Both seek to control primary and intermediate as well as superior education. Assuredly, the regents of the present day must differ from the popular idea which had been well expressed by the present Chancellor, Mr. George William Curtis, in his address of 1890: "The regent of fifty years ago was supposed to be a venerable figure; either bald or gray-headed, of irreproachable respectability, and inexpressible pomp of manner, whose tottering steps were aided by a gold-headed cane, whose mysterious office was uncomprehended, if not incomprehensible, and whose aspect altogether might suggest a fossilized functionary of the paleozoic period." A glance at the long list of distinguished men who have filled these high positions for upwards of a century, is sufficient proof of the efficiency and value of their work. They deserve well of the State, and should have the hearty support and sympathy of the people.

Several of our Catholic colleges have been corporate portions of the university for many years, though they have no share in the literature fund, as none but secondary schools have this privilege.

The first Catholic academy to be chartered was St. Mary's Institute, Amsterdam, New York. This new departure took place about eight years ago. It was then considered an innovation,

and received much adverse criticism ; but its grand success has silenced the critics. A year or two later two of the leading Catholic schools in our central city made application for charters, but they encountered a great difficulty which, for a time, threatened to extinguish the hope entertained by earnest educators of obtaining something that might bring them nearer to a settlement, by which they might obtain their long delayed rights from the State. Objection was made in certain quarters that the State could not pay over money for school purposes to the principals of Catholic schools, who were also pastors of their respective churches, as by so doing there would be an appearance of a union of church and State. The difficulty was referred to the Hon. Francis Kernan, of Utica, who has been for many years a regent ; and, to his credit, be it said, that though in feeble health, he studied the question until a satisfactory solution suggested itself, whereby we were enabled to have our Syracuse schools chartered. Since then a great change has taken place ; new interest has been awakened ; the workings of the regent-system have been carefully studied, and many of the leading schools have been chartered. The following schools have been fully admitted to the University : the academies of Albany and Troy, under the charge of the Christian Brothers ; Mount St. Vincent, on the Hudson, under the charge of the Sisters of Charity ; the academies in charge of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, at Manhattanville, Albany and Rochester ; St. Mary's Academy, Ogdensburg ; D'Youlleville Academy, Plattsburgh ; Visitation Institute, Brooklyn ; Holy Angels' Academy, Buffalo ; La Salle Institute, Troy ; Mount St. Mary's Academy, Newburgh ; St. Bernard's Academy, Cohoes ; St. Joseph's Academy, Flushing ; St. Joseph's Academy, Lockport ; St. Peter's Academy, Rome ; St. Peter's Academy, Troy ; St. Joseph's Academy, Albany ; St. Patrick's Academy, Catskill ; St. Joseph's Academy, Brasher's Falls ; the Christian Brothers' Academy, Utica ; St. Joseph's Academy, Binghamton ; Nazareth Academy, Rochester ; Hogansburgh Academy, Hogansburgh. Many others have made application, but are not yet admitted. Such has been the growth of this movement in the interior of the State as regards our Catholic schools. How do we like the system ? Greatly. We suffer no interference on the part of the State officials concerning our methods or our internal management ; for the sole test is the success of our pupils in their examinations. Our teachers are not questioned as to their religion, nor is there any objection made to their religious habit ; our schools retain all their rights in the matter of text-books to be used and of subjects to be studied. We have clerical supervision in the matter of special studies not included in the regents' course. We observe

our holy-days without protest or interference from any one. We have our prayers and devotions, our catechism and our Bible history, and no one objects. There is no objection as to our use of religious emblems; all this is left to the judgment of pastors and teachers. We retain them in every class-room, and there is no question raised as to their presence.

It may be asked what are the advantages of being under the regents? There are many. We would place before all other considerations the breaking down of prejudice. Our separated brethren look more kindly upon us, in proportion as they come more in contact with us. They realize that we are anxious for the improvement of our children; that we do not wish to keep them in ignorance, as has been so often said even by well-meaning people, who had no opportunity of knowing better. They find that our children will compare favorably with the children of other schools in manners, dress, and in all desirable accomplishments. The officers of the regents visit our schools; they learn to appreciate the work of our religious communities, and freely admit that in many cases our parish schools surpass the public schools, even with the public treasury at their back. They have great confidence in the manner in which we live up to the spirit and the letter of their school regulations. They see for themselves that we are not lacking in the spirit of patriotism and love of American institutions; for our children are taught to refer to the cross of our church and the flag of our country as to allied emblems of freedom and happiness. In the Convocation we are represented by some of our most distinguished Catholic educators, who go there as exponents of our side of this all-important educational question. Our clergymen and religious teachers sit side by side, and exchange views, with the eminent educators who are not of our faith. Time was when we could not obtain a hearing in such assemblies. But we have changed all that. Men are no longer satisfied concerning any question till they have found what Catholics have to say upon that question.

Another great benefit is the removing of prejudices from the minds of our Catholic people. Many of them are accustomed to look upon our Catholic schools as very good places for small children. They admit that the good sisters and brothers are excellent in the work of instilling the principles of religion and morality into the young minds, but they are prone to believe that when called upon to teach the sciences and literature, our Catholic teachers are not up to the standard. This false impression is removed from their minds when they learn from the annual report of the regents that our schools hold their own, and that in many cases they surpass those of our non-Catholic neighbors.

And this is true, even though the course cannot be considered too friendly to our people. To the reasoning mind this result should not create surprise. Our religious teachers are teachers by life-long profession. With them the education of youth is not a temporary occupation, to be exchanged at the first opportunity for something more lucrative, or pleasant, or honorable; it is to engage their attention until death; and every moment is utilized by them in perfecting themselves in their high calling. In consequence, whenever open competition for government appointments and public prizes has been announced, our Catholic pupils have come out victorious; and it is to be borne in mind that such results have been obtained for a small fraction of the *per capita* amount spent upon the least of our public schools.

Another benefit is the healthy spirit of emulation fostered among our children and teachers. They learn to appreciate the systematic examinations of the regents, and soon come to understand the necessity of thorough study if they would be successful. If they wish to continue with their classes they must march on. There is no time to be wasted; the special work for every week of the year is laid out. It is objected that the system tends to cram, and give quantity rather than quality. There may be some truth in the objection, but, of the two evils, give us push and study rather than the creeping system that begins nowhere, ends nowhere, and is forever floundering in the slough of despondency. If we wish to keep pace with the age in all that the age would impart to us, we must adopt the latest and the best methods in every line of study. This we can do in all Catholic schools without sacrificing the education of the heart and the soul. The spirit of emulation is the fruitful source of advancement for our teachers. The fact that the standing of the school is recorded in a printed annual report is a great incentive to the teachers to leave nothing undone to bring the school up to the highest point of excellence. Under this system every pastor is in position to know the standing of his school. Thus the placing of our schools under the regents will have the effect of instilling new life into pupils and teachers. The very conditions are stimulating. To be received into the university the school must have a good working library of standard authors for the daily use of the academic pupils. The collection of books may be increased, from time to time, through the earnest efforts of pastor, teachers, and wealthy members of the parish. This will place within reach of the children the very best literature. They will learn to read the great authors, under the direction of trained minds; and thus, before they leave school, they will have acquired a taste for good reading. There must also be a complete set of apparatus for the study of physics, a chemical laboratory, and a

collection of minerals, charts, globes and the like. All these things tend to make the class-room more attractive, and to make intelligible the subject-matters taught; the pupils become absorbed in their studies and are filled with love for their school. All these things may be expensive and difficult to obtain, but if we wish to attract our children to our schools, we must be willing to make sacrifices so as to give them as good an intellectual training as can be given under any other system.

Here we beg respectfully to differ with those who object to the expense of continuing the higher studies of the Catholic youth under the ægis of Holy Church. Some there are who display a laudable zeal in providing for the thoroughly Christian education of little children, but who, with what appears to us to be a strange inconsistency, are willing to allow the young to complete their studies in an un-Catholic atmosphere removed from the salutary influence of the Church. May it never happen that we shall be constrained to suffer our children to be at any period of their education estranged from Christian direction; but should the dire necessity to make choice be laid upon us, we are not resolved whether we should not consider Christian *higher* education even more important than Christian *primary* and *intermediate* education. The Catholic School is no mere kindergarten. Distinctively Catholic education is the imparting of sublime *verities* to an intellect sufficiently developed to appreciate them, and of pure and severe *morals* to a fallen nature struggling with passions which grow stronger with age. During early childhood, one is lovingly attached to home and parents. Evil influences detrimental to faith and morals increase in power and number when the passions begin to ferment and the youthful intellect to grow wayward and self-reliant. This is precisely the period when the boy or girl ought to be predominantly under the influence of pastor and religious teachers, and jealously secluded from every source of intellectual or moral danger. Then again, we feel that it is unjust, it is inconsistent, it is "a lame and impotent conclusion," after all the expense incurred and trouble endured during these years of primary training, to allow the godless system to claim as its own by right of inheritance those whom Holy Church has labored so hard to bring forth unto Christ: Merely for the sake of economizing the comparatively slight additional expense needed to complete gloriously what was bravely begun!

The fact that our children graduate from their own schools, gives those schools a reputation they could otherwise never secure. Parents become more interested in the work of education as they witness class after class step forth from their Alma Mater, ready to begin the battle of life with intellect, heart, and soul, properly trained.

The regents' system is, therefore a great boon, if for no other reason than that it is a means of keeping our children interested in their studies, and remaining with us until they graduate. But this is not all. It is, though in an inadequate manner, a financial aid to the Catholic clergy and laity in the support of their schools in such details as are most easily overlooked. It prepares the way for a general distribution to all parochial and private schools of the money collected by the State for educational purposes. It familiarizes the authorities with the character of our work. It is an apprenticeship in which we prove our fitness for our work. It brings home to outsiders, as nothing else can, that the institutions of our country need suffer no damage by paying us properly for our work.

The regents' examinations date back to 1822. The members desired then to establish a more elevated course of instruction in the academies subject to their visitations, by defining with greater certainty the various branches of study which should entitle the institutions in which they are passed to a distributive share of the literature fund, and they ordained that no scholar should be considered of academic rank until he were proficient in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, spelling, and geography. The pupils to be examined are furnished with printed questions. Precautions are taken to secure honest work and reliable returns. All papers claimed by principals to have passed are re-examined at the regents' office. If found correct, pass-cards and certificates are issued to the successful pupils. The allowance from the academic fund is determined by the record of these pass-cards and credentials. Schools are allowed \$5 for each junior certificate of twenty counts, \$5 more for thirty counts, and an extra \$5 for forty counts, and the same for fifty counts; \$10 for an English academic diploma, and \$15 for a classical diploma.¹ The balance of the State fund (\$106,000 annually) is apportioned in proportion to the aggre-

¹ UNIVERSITY CREDENTIALS.—A junior certificate of twenty counts includes physiology and hygiene, United States History, drawing and the six preliminary studies.

An academic certificate may be received for thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy or eighty counts.

The English diploma of fifty counts includes the six preliminary studies,—English composition, English literature, a course of English reading, algebra, plane geometry, physics, chemistry and physical geography. Also botany, physiology and hygiene, English History, United States History, civics, economics, ethics, book-keeping, and drawing.

The classical diploma of fifty counts includes the six preliminary studies; English composition; Latin in the first year; Caesar's "Commentaries," four books; Cicero's "Orations"; Virgil's "Æneid," six books; Latin composition; Greek in the first year; Xenophon's "Anabasis," three books; Homer's "Iliad," three books; Greek composition; algebra; plane geometry; physiology and hygiene; Greek History; Roman History; United States History.

gate daily attendance in each academy chartered under the regents. On application, assistance is granted for the purchase of books and apparatus of not more than \$150 a year in succession. The amount we receive, though not large, is a great encouragement. If the same principles were applied to the primary departments, it would be a step in advance towards the solution of the great problem. At all events, the Catholics of the State should remember that the regents have made it possible for them to place their Catholic schools on the same footing with all other schools of the State.

It is a step, however short and inadequate, towards righting the great wrong of taxing us for schools to which we cannot in conscience send our children. We hold that education to be dangerous to church, to state, and to the individual which ignores the spiritual life of the child, and we further hold that the Church and the home cannot make up for the loss of such an education as will cultivate the heart and the soul as well as the intellect. We would teach our little ones that first they must seek the Kingdom of God and His justice, and then all things else shall be added unto them.

Why should the State object to this doctrine? If we give the child as good an intellectual training as can be given in the public schools, why should the State object to have the training made more perfect by instilling into the young heart the principles of religious morality? We feel the great injustice of taxation without representation, and we trust our American fellow-citizens will right this great wrong, and grant us now through good-will and brotherly love what must eventually be granted as a patent right.

J. F. MULLANEY.

Scientific Chronicle.

LIGHT-HOUSES AND OTHER AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES.¹

AMERICA was discovered in 1492, but neither Columbus nor his successors seem to have found any light-houses on the coast. The "noble red-man" did not know, probably did not even suspect, that any private advantage was to be derived from such things, and he was never wont to waste his energies on works of mere public utility. For a long time the Europeans who followed in the wake of Columbus neglected, in their mad rush for wealth, to form any permanent settlements; and the governments that fitted out the first expeditions to the New World, had but one object in view, gold; gold to pay their armies and carry on their wars, gold to pamper the "noble" white man, and maintain him in idleness and luxury. So long as the new comers were still leading a nomadic life, light-houses would probably prove an encumbrance rather than an aid, in fact, a sort of luggage somewhat difficult to handle.

After the landing of Columbus, nearly three-quarters of a century elapsed before the founding of the first town, in what is now the territory of the United States, viz.: St. Augustine, Florida; and a half century more before the colonization of Virginia and Massachusetts. The first colonists immediately entered into commercial relations with the old World, and must therefore soon have felt the necessity of beacons to guide their home-returning vessels to a safe anchorage. Hence they must have established light signals of some kind near the entrance of their harbors. Still, strange to say, we find no account of such signals until more than fifty years after the landing at Plymouth.

In the record of the proceedings of the "General Court of the Province of Massachusetts Bay," under the date of March 9, 1673, appears a petition from the good people of Nantasket (now called Hull), praying for the lessening of their taxes, because of the material and labor they had contributed, over and above their proportion, in building the beacon on Point Allerton, the most prominent head-land near the entrance to Boston Harbor. They had furnished 400 boat-loads of stone, for which, as well as for their labor, they were paid by order of the Court, and also for making and furnishing "fier-bales of pitch and ocum for the beacon at Allerton Point." These "fier-bales" were burned in an open iron grate or basket on the top of the beacon. The keeping up of this light must have been rough work in stormy weather, and it was precisely in stormy weather that it was most needed. We

¹ The material for the present article has been drawn in great part from "The Modern Light-House Service," by A. B. Johnson, chief clerk of the United States Light-House Board, Washington, 1890.

have been unable to find the date on which the last "fier-bale" shed its last cheering rays over the waters of Massachusetts Bay.

An interval of forty-two years however, brings us to another record, by which we find that the first real light-house on this continent was built on Little Brewster Island, at the entrance to Boston Harbor, in 1715-16. It was erected by order, and at the expense of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay, at a cost of £2285 17s. 8½d. That last half-penny looks exasperatingly exact, and reminds us of the conscientious scrupulousness with which our own Congress, in 1889, made an appropriation: "For repairs of light-houses, one dollar." How many light-houses were to be repaired for that sum, or how it was to be divided among them, is not stated. The light on Little Brewster Island was supported by light-dues of 1d. per ton, levied by the collector of imports at Boston, on all incoming and outgoing vessels, except coasters. Why this exception was made is not clear, unless perchance it was done as an encouragement to home trade. Our knowledge of this, the Father of American light-houses, is not overpoweringly full. About all we can say is, that, judging from an engraving made shortly after its erection, and dedicated to "The Merchants of Boston" by William Burgis, it was a frustum of a cone, and probably about 150 feet high, with lower and upper diameters of 25 and 13 feet respectively. A two-story house attached to the tower, and having a gable-chimney outside, served as a residence for the keeper.

The other colonies along the coast followed the example of Massachusetts, and when in 1789, the Federal Government, according to the provisions of the constitution just then adopted, took charge of the harbors and navigable waters of the country, the light-houses and all pertaining to them naturally fell into its hands. They were at that date eight in number, spaced along the coast as follows:

Portsmouth Harbor Light, New Hampshire; Boston Harbor Light, Little Brewster Island, Mass.; The Gurnet Light near Plymouth, Mass.; Brant Point Light on Nantucket Island, Mass.; Beaver Tail Light on Conanicut Island, R. I.; Sandy Hook Light, N. J. (entrance to New York Harbor); Cape Henlopen Light (entrance to Delaware Bay), Del.; Charleston Main Light, Morris Island, Charleston, S. C.

All of these lights are still in existence, though so greatly improved that they are the same only in purpose and site. Even this much would tend to show that, in as far as they could go, our ancestors chose wisely and well.

In one hundred years, that is, up to August, 1889, the number increased fully a hundred fold, there being at that date 802 light stations within the limits of the United States. This does not include "post" lights, that is, substantial lens-lanterns suspended on a post, eight or ten feet from the ground, along river banks or in places where a regular light-house would be impossible or unnecessary. Of these there are over one thousand five hundred in use. It will be noticed that the rate of increase of light-houses in the country has been five times as great as that of the population in the same time.

It may be worth while here to give a few figures to show how we stand in this matter in comparison with other lands. There are, as nearly as can be ascertained, about six thousand light stations in the world, distributed as follows:

Europe:

Great Britain and Ireland,	817
France,	444
Sweden,	295
Italy,	244
Norway,	220
Spain,	187
Germany,	179
Turkey,	168
Holland,	166
Russia,	154
Denmark,	132
Black Sea (Russia and Turkey),	88
Portugal,	29
Belgium,	18
Unaccounted for in Johnson's list,	168

3309

North America:

United States (exclusive of post lights):

Atlantic Coast,	467
Gulf Coast,	79
Pacific Coast,	38
The Great Lakes,	218
	802

Dominion of Canada,	443
Newfoundland,	51
Mexico and neighboring States,	33

1329

Asia,	476
Oceanica,	319
Africa,	219
South America,	167
West Indies,	106

5925

It is not pretended that this list is absolutely complete, as parts of it are made up from statements which are several years old, and it is highly probable, at the present date, that the total number has reached, if it has not surpassed, the full six thousand. A man being placed at a proper distance out in space, could therefore see, on an average, three thousand of our lights at once, and, curiously enough, this is just about the number of stars visible to the naked eye on a perfectly clear moonless night.

The light-house system of a country ought to keep abreast of its commerce, or rather it should keep a little ahead, in order to lure it on. Other things being equal commerce will seek most willingly those ports where its ships can enter as securely by night as by day, and hence all maritime nations have considered the establishment of a good light-house

system as a work of great importance closely connected with the prosperity of the whole land. The commerce of the United States, as indicated by the tonnage of its three coasts, is about one-tenth of that of the whole world, and its coast lights alone (584) are nearly in the same proportion, while if we include the lake commerce the total mounts up to nearly one-seventh, and the lights to almost the same proportion. Finally, if we count in our river trade, we find that we are doing one-fifth of the trading, by water, of the world. This is not a bad showing for an infant of only a hundred years, but it emphasizes the fact that we still need many more light-houses. Great Britain holds to-day one-half of the commerce of the world, we have one-fifth of it, leaving three-tenths for all other nations together. It is no exaggeration to say that our progress during the past hundred years has been rapid, and if we behave ourselves, and don't get into any school-boy fights, we may confidently expect, before the end of our second century, to rival, perhaps to surpass, everything the world has hitherto seen. One of the most important factors in this race for commercial supremacy will be a large-minded, generous policy in regard to the erection and equipment of light-houses.

The true theory of coast lighting is that each coast shall be so set with towers that the rays from their lights shall meet and pass each other, so that a vessel on the coast shall never be out of sight of a light, and that there shall be no dark spaces between the lights. This is the theory upon which the United States is proceeding, and it plants lights where they are most needed, always, however, keeping this idea in view. Hence, from year to year the length of the dark spaces is lessened, and the day will come when all our coasts will be defined, from end to end, by a band of light by night and by well-marked beacons by day.

One essential element in all this business is, of course, the cost. The statistics available for the consideration of this point, and which have been published from time to time by the treasury department, begin on July 1, 1790, and end on June 30, 1890. Later ones have not yet come to hand, but these, giving, as they do, the record for exactly one hundred years will suffice for our present purpose. The total expenses of the light-house establishment during that time was \$93,238,925.80, but the amounts for each year have varied widely. Thus, the smallest sum expended in any one year was \$12,061.68, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1793; the largest sum, that for the year 1889-90, was \$3,503,994.12; the ratio of the lowest to the highest being therefore as *one to two hundred and ninety*. In a general way, the expenditure has gone on increasing from year to year, according as the extent of our territory has increased and its population become more dense and its resources been developed; but there have been some marked retrograde movements. For instance, in 1804-5 the expenditure was, in round numbers, \$122,000, but the following year it went down to less than \$89,000; by 1813 it had risen to \$128,000, but the second year after it was only \$48,000. This may have been due, in part at least, to our "unpleasantness" with Great Britain during those years. Since 1815 we have

never spent less than \$100,000 a year, and, strangely enough, the great crisis of 1837 had no seeming effect whatever on the light-house appropriations. In 1853-4 the expense had reached to the sum of \$1,310,978.42, and it has never gone below a million dollars a year since that date, except from 1860 to 1864, during most of which time the Confederacy was kindly taking care of a certain number of our lights, and so we were spared both anxiety and expense. Since 1864 it has never fallen below two millions, except once, and even in that case but slightly. The expenditure for 1889-90 (which we have given above) would more than cover the first twenty-six years of our light-house existence.

To give a more comprehensive view of our subject we are obliged to inflict on our readers another dose of arithmetic. According to a statement rendered to the Light-House Board on August 15th, 1889, by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the water frontage of the United States measures in statute miles as follows :

General sea-coast :

Atlantic Ocean,	2043
Gulf of Mexico,	1852
Pacific Ocean,	1810
Alaska,	4750
	<hr/>
	10,455

Including islands, bays, etc., to the head of tide-water :

Atlantic Ocean,	36,516
Gulf of Mexico,	19,143
Pacific Ocean,	8,900
Alaska,	26,376
The Lakes (about),	3,000
	<hr/>
	93,935

Of this immense distance, which is almost four times the circumference of the earth, and considerably more than one-third of the distance to the moon, 11,533 miles are illuminated by light-houses. On an average, therefore, each of our 802 lights is responsible for $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles of coast, and to light up our entire shores to the same degree would require eight times as many, or over 6000 light-houses. Evidently, there is plenty of work ahead and plenty of room to work in.

In the foregoing enumeration we have not included the "post" system of river lighting. The river light is treated as separate and distinct from other lights, and is put in a class by itself, being temporary as to its life and shifting as to its place, since its most frequent use is to mark the position of accidental obstructions or the changes in the river banks themselves. The aggregate navigable length of our principal rivers is put down at 4477 miles, supplied (June 30, 1889) with 1557 post-lights, that is, about 1 for every three miles. In most light-house districts (of which more anon) post-lights are to be found, but they are established and maintained from a separate fund, at a cost of about \$150 a year for

each light, whereas the running expense of a light-house will average nearly \$2000 for the same time. They have been found to serve their purpose admirably, and, on account of their cheapness, they are being multiplied rapidly. For the year 1889-99, Congress appropriated \$254,000 "for establishing, supplying, and maintaining post-lights" at various points on twenty-five of the rivers of the country, and the amount has doubtless been increased since that date.

Where a post-light would be absurdly inadequate, and where, at the same time, a light-house is necessary but has not been built, either because of the great difficulty or of the expense, recourse is had to another expedient—the light-ship. As its purpose is to do the work of a light-house, it should have the permanency and efficiency of the light-house. To secure either of these is a matter of great difficulty. When moorings have been made too heavy to drag, chains have broken; when they have held, mooring-bits have been torn out; when neither would give, the ship has foundered at her anchors, unless she sought a harbor or put out to sea for safety. But a light-ship away from her moorings is worse than no light-ship at all, because it is in heavy weather that she is most needed. However, with modern improvements in riding-gear, these things seldom happen now-a-days.

We have between thirty and forty light-ships; the smaller, slighter-built ones being moored in sounds and bays, the larger in the open ocean, sometimes 20 to 30 miles from land. The finest of these ships are from 120 to 150 feet in length, cost from \$50,000 to \$70,000 to build, and from \$5000 to \$8000 for yearly maintenance and repairs. On account of this large outlay the government is trying to replace them, as far as possible, with light-houses.

Besides lights, many other aids to navigation have been devised, such as buoys, bells, whistles, fog-horns, etc.

The buoy is to the seaman, by day, what the light is at night, and what the fog-signal is in thick weather. It tells him by its size, form, color, and number, how to avoid rocks and shoals, and shows the way in and out of harbor. Buoys are of wood or iron. The wooden buoys are spars of spruce, pine, or cedar, from 12 to 60 feet long and a foot or more in diameter. To the larger end is attached an iron sleeve-and-eye, to which the mooring-chain can be fastened. They are classified according to their length, thickness, and color. They cost from \$15 to \$50 each.

Iron buoys are made hollow, with air-tight compartments, and are of three shapes, called nun, can, and ice buoys. The nun buoy is nearly a complete cone in the upper part and almost a hemisphere in the lower. The can buoy differs from this in having the upper part nearly cylindrical; in both the height is from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 times the diameter. They vary in height from 5 to 10 feet, and cost from \$50 to \$150 each. The ice buoy resembles somewhat the wooden spar-buoy, but it is thicker in the middle portion of its length, and tapers toward each end. A 40-foot ice buoy will stand 17 feet out of water; a 50-foot one, 22 feet; they cost from \$180 to \$275 each. Moorings for buoys are either blocks of

stone, or iron, or regular anchors. Chains have been used from the beginning to connect the buoys to their moorings, but latterly ropes of iron wire are being substituted for the chains, especially in the deeper waters and the more exposed situations.

By Act of Congress, September 28, 1850, it was prescribed that red buoys with even numbers should be placed on the right-hand side, and black buoys with odd numbers on the left-hand side of channels approached from seaward; that buoys placed on wrecks or other obstructions, having a channel on each side, should be painted with red and black horizontal stripes; that those buoys placed in mid-channel, and which are to indicate that they must be passed "close-to" to avoid danger, should be painted with red and black vertical stripes; and finally, that perches with balls, cages, etc., should be placed on buoys to indicate a turning-point, the color and number of the buoy showing the side on which they are to be passed.

Buoys are exposed to many dangers, not the least of which is that of being run down and ripped open by passing steamers. As the iron buoys are made with compartments, they are rarely sunk, but their buoyancy is lessened and their usefulness to that extent impaired. Spar buoys frequently lose a portion of their length, which is cut off by strokes of colliding propeller-blades. In spite of State and national statutes to the contrary, vessels will sometimes make fast to buoys, thus gradually dragging them off their bearings. A buoy has sometimes been set adrift that a reward might be obtained for its recovery, but this kind of "rough gambling," as it has been called, is hardly profitable. It requires too many confederates and the danger of detection is too great. The buoy's worst enemy, however, is ice, when moving in mass with a tide or current. A well-made, well-moored buoy, at the mouth of a narrow river can create an ice-gorge; but usually, when the ice moves in force, the buoys have their mooring loops torn out, their chains broke or their anchors weighed; in each case the buoys are carried out to sea, when the buoy tenders give chase, and if successful in their capture, return them to position. The sea-going qualities of buoys are very good, and they have at times made long volunteer voyages. One is now anchored off the coast of Ireland, where it was picked up, about six months after it had been wrenched from its place in New York harbor. Its arrival was duly reported by the Irish Lighthouse Board, but in deference to its longing for the "ould sod" it was presented to the Irish board, and is now the only genuine American-Irish buoy.

Wooden spar-buoys and iron ice-buoys are rarely, if ever, carried away by the ice; they "duck under" and let it pass. In the winter of 1880-81, New York harbor was twice swept clean of all other buoys, some of which were recovered, but many of them were never heard of again. Notwithstanding the great expense of such accidents as these, the importance of keeping that harbor and bay well marked, has moved the board to keep the buoys in position, all the year round, though in places of less importance the nun and can buoys are towed to a place of safety for the winter.

There were, in 1889, in the several districts, 4309 buoys. The appropriation for that year was \$325,000.

Lights by night and buoys by day are the only signals needed when the weather is clear, but nobody needs to be told how inadequate they are when the weather is thick with fog. When sight fails we must have recourse to some other of our senses, and as smell, taste and touch are unavailable at long ranges, all that is left is to fall back on the sense of hearing. About all known sources of sound, which seemed to give any promises of practical results, have been tried, and it is difficult to decide which is the best or which the worst among them.

Guns were used formerly much more than at present, and the testimony as to their usefulness is very conflicting. Admiral Sir A. Milne said he had often gone into Halifax harbor in a fog as dense as a wall, guided solely by the sound of the fog-gun. Professor Henry says that a fog-gun was used at Point Boneta, San Francisco Bay, in 1856-57, and that by its help, vessels which otherwise could not have entered, came into the harbor during the fog, by night as well as by day. The gun was fired every half hour, night and day, during foggy weather, and this amounted to 1582 discharges in one year. Yet it was replaced by a trumpet, and this in turn by a first-class siren.

A gun was also used at West Quoddy Head, Maine. It was five feet long, with a bore of five and one-quarter inches, and was charged with four pounds of powder. It could be heard from two to six miles, but says Professor Henry: "The signal was abandoned because of the danger attending its use, the long intervals between successive shots, and the brief duration of sound, which rendered it difficult to determine its direction with accuracy."

Numerous careful experimental tests were made in England, under the direction of Professor Tyndall, to determine the efficiency of the gun as a fog-signal. The summing up of the results was: "The duration of the sound is so short that, unless the observer is prepared beforehand, the sound through lack of attention rather than through its own powerlessness, is liable to be unheard. Its liability to be quenched by local sound is so great that it is sometimes obliterated by a puff of wind taking possession of the ears at the time of its arrival. Its liability to be quenched by an opposing wind, so as to be practically useless at a very short distance to windward, is very remarkable." In the face of these facts Tyndall gravely concludes: "Still, notwithstanding these drawbacks, I think the gun is entitled to rank as a first-class signal." In the United States the gun has, we believe, been practically abandoned as far as the lighthouse is concerned, but, as a signal of distress, the minute-gun at sea holds its time-honored place the world over.

Even were the gun much more efficient than it has proved to be, it could scarcely be mounted or safely be used in an isolated rock lighthouse. In such cases an explosive rocket has been prepared. A charge of from two to six pounds of gun-cotton is enclosed in the head of a rocket which is projected to a height of 1000 feet, when the charge is exploded. The sound has been heard for a distance of twenty-five miles.

It labors, however, under the same difficulty as the sound of the gun, being too brief to be located with certainty.

Gongs are used to some extent in Europe, especially on light-ships. They are effective for very short ranges only, say a half-mile or less, and have been but little used in this country.

Fog-bells are in use at most United States light-stations, whether ashore or afloat. Some of them are worked by hand, others by machinery. Of the latter class there are about 125 on our coasts. They weigh from 300 to 3000 pounds, and experiments show that their range can be considerably increased by increasing the rapidity of the bell-strokes, and also by the use of a reflector. For the larger bells the effective range varies from one to three miles, according to the force and direction of the wind. As a coast signal the bell is hardly reliable even in calm weather, while in a storm, the noise of the surf will often drown its sound to seaward altogether. On shipboard, however, the use of bells at regular intervals during fog is required by the international code of all nations. Turkish ships, however, are allowed to substitute a gong or gun, as the use of bells is forbidden to the followers of Mohammed.

The steam-whistle, used as a signal, is simply a gigantic locomotive or steamboat whistle. It is described by Price-Edwards as an instrument producing sound "by the vibration of a column of air contained within the bell or dome, the vibration being set up by the impact of a current of air or steam at high pressure." It is probable that the metal of the bell is also set in vibration, and that these secondary vibrations give to the sound its timbre or quality. Difference in pitch is obtained by altering the distance between the steam orifice and the rim of the bell. When these are brought close together the sound is very shrill, but it becomes deeper as the distance between them is increased. The diameter of the whistle is from 16 to 18 inches. It is operated by steam at a pressure of from 50 to 100 pounds. In the latest and most improved forms the steam is admitted and cut off automatically, at intervals determined beforehand, and so the whistle will continue to give forth intermittent sounds as long as the steam supply is kept up. The intensity of the sound depends on the size of the instrument and on the steam pressure employed; the range varies with these conditions from 3 to 20 miles. Despite their high price (about \$200 each), they are coming into extended use in this country.

The whistling buoy is a pear-shaped, hollow, iron bulb, measuring 12 feet across at its widest part, and floating 12 feet out of water. A tube nearly 3 feet in diameter passes from the top of the bulb, through the bottom, and reaches to a depth of 32 feet in the water below. The tube is open at its lower end, but the upper end is controlled by two valves, one opening inwards, the other outwards. As there is no communication between the tube and the air in the bulb, the rise of the water in the tube does not materially affect the buoyancy of the apparatus. The working is after this manner. When the bulb rises on the wave the column of water in the tube falls, and in doing so it draws air in through one of the valves at the top. When the bulb descends with the wave

the column of water in the tube rises, compresses the enclosed air and forces it out through the other valve to a whistle fixed above. These buoys have been heard, under favorable circumstances, to a distance of 15 miles, and the sound is described as "inexpressibly mournful and saddening." The mournfulness of the sound is undoubtedly due to the ever varying intensity of the note, and this is due to the ever varying pressure of the air current.

A whistler of the size named above will weigh about 12,000 pounds. A smaller one has, however, been tried and has been found quite satisfactory. It has a diameter of 6 feet, with a tube only 10 feet long, and weighs but 2000 pounds. It has the advantage over the larger model of being available in much shallower water, of putting less strain on its mooring-gear, and therefore of being less liable to go away on unauthorized holidays; while, at the same time, its song is nearly as strong and fully as mournful as that of its bigger brother. Of all sizes, there are sixty odd of these whistling buoys on our coasts. On an average, they cost about \$1000 each; but, once established, the running expenses are slight, except when they run away. They do their own blowing, and do it cheaply and well.

Buoys carrying bells have been known for a long time. Some hundreds of years ago, when pirates on the high seas were almost as numerous as merchantmen, there was such a buoy off the east coast of Scotland, on the spot where the great Bell Rock Light House now stands. This place was at that time called the Inch Cape Rock, and Southey tells us in rhyme of the ups and downs of its buoy. Aberbrothock was, and is, a little town 58 miles N. N. E. of Edinburgh. It contained an abbey built in 1178, by William the Lion, King of Scotland, in honor of Thomas à Becket, who had been martyred eight years before. The abbey was plundered and destroyed by the Reformers in 1560. Now, let us listen to a few lines from Southey:

"It was the Abbot of Aberbrothock
Who placed that bell on the Inch Cape Rock.
On a buoy in the stream (?) it floated and swung,
And over the waves its warning rung.
And every ship that came to that rock
Would bless the Abbot of Aberbrothock."

Then, one fine day, an honorable pirate, Sir Ralph the Rover, sailing out on a one-sided trading expedition, through sheer malice, determines to destroy the signal:

"Quoth Ralph: 'My men, put out the boat
And row me to the Inch Cape float.'
The boat is lowered, the boatmen row,
And to the Inch Cape float they go.
Sir Ralph leans over from the boat
And cuts the bell from the Inch Cape float.
The bell sinks down with a gurgling sound,
The bubbles rise and burst around.
Quoth Ralph: 'The next who comes to the rock
Won't bless the Abbot of Aberbrothock,'"

The pirate then sails away, and, by strict attention to business, soon gets rich and returns ; but nearing the coast in a dense fog :

"The vessel strikes with a shivering shock ;
Oh heavens ! it is the Inch Cape Rock."

The Hon. Sir Ralph was drowned, and it served him right. The bell-buoy established by the good Abbot, at his own expense, was a primitive affair, a wooden buoy, with a bell swung by a hempen rope. Improvements have been made since those days, and, in our waters, Sir Ralph, or Sir Any-body-else, would have need of something more than a sheath-knife or a cutlass to dismantle a bell-buoy.

In our present practice, a hemispherical iron cup, more than 6 feet across, is decked over with iron, and a heavy weight is swung beneath it to keep it righted. On the deck is erected a triangular, skeleton pyramid, made of heavy angle-iron and standing 9 feet high. To the inside of this, and near the top, a 300-pound bell is securely fastened. To the frame a circular iron plate with deep grooves running radially is attached quite close to the rim of the bell, and on the plate is laid a free cannon ball. As the buoy rolls on the sea the ball rolls on the plate ; but as it can move only in the direction of the grooves, it must strike the bell fair at each motion, and so produce a sound the intensity of which is in proportion to the force of the blow. The bell-buoy, therefore, just as the whistling-buoy, sounds the loudest when the sea is roughest, but the bell-buoy is adapted to shoal water where the whistling-buoy could not ride, and if there is any motion at all in the sea, the bell-buoy will give some sound. Hence the whistling-buoy is used in roadsteads and the open sea, while the bell-buoy is preferred in harbors and rivers where the sound-range needed is shorter, and where smoother water usually obtains. In 1889 there were 70 of these bell-buoys in the waters of the United States. They cost about \$350 apiece.

The speaking-trumpet is well known, and requires no description here. It is a powerful instrument for magnifying sound and for carrying it to considerable distances, but we are still waiting patiently for the man who will explain the secret of its power. At any rate, it is but natural that it should be tried as a fog-signal. It is unnecessary however, to say that, when it is intended for this purpose, we do not rely on the human voice as the source of sound. In practice, the sound is produced by a vibrating reed, or by a siren, of which latter more anon.

The fog-trumpet is a conical tube 17 feet long, with a throat $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter and a flaring mouth more than 3 feet across. In a resounding cavity back of the throat is fixed a steel tongue 10 inches long, $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide, one inch thick at its fixed end, and half that at its free end. When air, condensed by suitable machinery, is driven, under a pressure of from 15 to 20 pounds, through the trumpet, the tongue vibrates vigorously, and a shriek is given forth which has sometimes been heard to a distance of 15 miles. One drawback to this instrument is that there is too much complication about it, requiring, as it does, a condensing apparatus worked by a steam-engine or some equivalent.

Besides, the tongue is an unruly contrivance and is liable to give trouble ; so that great care is needed in the management of the instrument, and even in skilled hands it is liable to fail at a critical moment. For this reason it has not come into extended use in this country. Why the engine and condenser could not be dispensed with, and steam be driven directly through the trumpet has not been made clear. We claim no patent however for the suggestion.

The siren, as an instrument of physics, was invented by Cagniard de Latour. It was adapted to be used as a fog-signal by A. and F. Brown, of New York, under the direction of Professor Henry. Across the throat of a huge trumpet, similar to the one described above, is fixed a dish having 12 radial slits. Behind this and covering it, is a thick plate with the same number of similar openings. This plate is capable of rotating in close proximity to the dish. The slits in the rotating plate are not sawn perpendicularly to its face, but slantwise, in consequence of which, when a current of air or steam is driven through, the reaction against the edges of the slits causes the plate to rotate. The principle is the same as that on which the wind pressure against the slanting sails of a wind-mill causes the wheel to turn. In some instruments, we believe the plate is made to rotate by an independent piece of mechanism. This necessitates the employment of a motor, and complicates the instrument undesirably. In either case, when a slit in the rotating plate comes opposite to a slit in a fixed disk, the steam passes freely through ; when a slit in the plate comes opposite to a solid portion of the disk, the current is arrested. This alternate starting and stopping of the current sets up vibrations in the air, and when these succeed each other with sufficient rapidity, we have sound. Under a pressure of 70 pounds of steam, a nicely balanced plate will turn at the rate of 2400 times a minute ; and since there are 12 slits, we get 28,800 vibrations in that time. This corresponds to about the note *b* above the *a* of the normal tuning-fork. The volume of the sound is so great that it can be heard under favorable circumstances to a distance of 20 or 30 miles. "Its density, quality, pitch and penetration render it dominant over every noise, after all other signal-sounds have failed."

The average of all the tests show that the relative power of the different kinds of fog-signals may be expressed thus : siren 9, whistle 7, trumpet 4 ; and the relative cost of fuel to run them, thus : siren 9, whistle 3, trumpet 1. Their relative efficiency therefore, as regards the mere matter of fuel, would be : siren 3, whistle 7, trumpet 12 ; but it would be a grave error to conclude that therefore the trumpet is the best and the siren the worst. For, it must be borne in mind that in a dangerous place where the siren would just suffice to ensure safety, the trumpet or whistle would toot in vain.

In 1889 there were in operation in the United States, on light-ships, in light-houses and at other points, 81 fog-signals worked by machinery. They were set up at a cost of over \$600,000 and are maintained at a yearly outlay of more than \$100,000. These may seem large sums, but we must not forget that the loss of a single large steamship would far outweigh them all.

There are, connected with our light-house system, many points of general and scientific interest, about which we would be glad to say a few words, but we have trespassed so far already on the patience of our readers, that we must forbear. Still we must beg leave to add just a word about the light-house administration.

Our Light-house Board is composed of two navy officers, of high rank, two army officers of the engineer corps, two civilians of high scientific attainments, a navy and an army officer, to act as secretaries, making in all eight persons, besides the Secretary of the Treasury, who is *ex-officio* president of the board. The board has full charge of all existing light-houses, and other aids to navigation, but additions thereto, and all appropriations, both for current expenses and for new work, must come from Congress.

The whole country is divided into sixteen "Districts"; but poor Alaska is not included, being, as it were, left out in the cold.

Subordinate to the board, are the inspectors, always chosen from the ranks of the navy, and the local engineers, chosen from the army. Each district is provided with one inspector and one engineer. Their duties are sufficiently indicated by their titles. They receive no pay except their regular navy or army salary, according to their rank.

Light-house keepers are required to undergo a three months' trial in the service, and to be examined as to qualifications, before receiving a regular appointment. The salary varies from \$100 to \$1000 a year, according to the importance of the post. The appropriation made by Congress for 1889-90 was \$625,000, being the amount estimated sufficient for the payment of the 1150 keepers and assistant keepers then employed.

On the whole our light-house system is one of the institutions of which the country may be modestly proud.

A GREAT DAM.

We are all acquainted with the innate modesty of the average American. He cannot bear to admit that anything is ever done abroad equal to what is done at home. And yet, at times, we come across engineering feats in other countries which cast into the shade his proudest achievements in the same line. An example of such a work is the great dam just completed in far-off India, and which is said to be, by all odds, the largest masonry dam in the world. It was not built for a boast, nor for any ornamental purpose, but for the very useful one of supplying water to the city of Bombay. The dam is about seventy miles distant, in a northerly direction from the city, and is constructed straight across the valley of the Tansa. The length of the dam is two miles, its greatest depth 118 feet, its thickness at the bottom 100 feet, narrowing to 16 feet at the top. The two faces of the dam are of cut stone, the space between being filled with rubble stone and cement, so that the whole forms

one solid mass throughout. Great care was taken to reach a solid foundation that would be proof against settling, and consequently dangerous strains and cracking. For this end, it was found necessary to excavate nearly 7,000,000 cubic feet of rock. The true masonry work amounted to about 11,000,000 cubic feet; the rubble work to 15,000,000 cubic feet; the sand, lime, and cement, to 6,000,000 cubic feet more; so that the entire contents of the dam reaches the enormous total of 32,000,000 cubic feet. A special difficulty in the undertaking arose from the lack of transportation facilities, so that all the sand, lime, and cement, as well as tools and machinery, had to be brought by animal power a distance of many miles.

From 10,000 to 12,000 men, with a proportionate number of animals, were employed during six working seasons of seven months each (*i.e.*, from October to May), so that the whole time was 42 months, or just $3\frac{1}{2}$ years. When the basin formed by the dam is filled, it will cover an area of 8 square miles, and is calculated to contain about 100,000,000,000 gallons, and to be capable of supplying 100,000,000 gallons a day the year around. The water is to be conducted to Bombay in iron pipes four feet in diameter, each section of which weighs about four tons. As there is no danger of freezing in that country, the pipes have been laid above ground. The engineers and contractors were from Edinburgh, while the pipes were supplied by a firm from Glasgow. The work has been done in the most thorough and substantial manner, and if no earthquakes attack it, there seems to be no reason why the dam should not be everlasting.

ELEVATOR NOTES.

Hardly anything is more typical of modern business life, in large American cities, than the passenger elevator. According as a city becomes more densely populated, its expansion upwards must advance more rapidly than its lateral expansion. On the other hand, this expansion skyward could not profitably take place, except to a very limited extent, were it not for the invention and perfection of the passenger elevator. Who, for example, would rent rooms for offices, or, indeed, for dwelling places, if, to reach them, he had to climb a stairway a hundred, two hundred, or three hundred feet high? If, however, access can be had to such rooms by an elevator, then they become at least as valuable as rooms lower down.

The passenger elevator may be considered as an evolution of the dumb-waiter, which we have had with us so long. The evolution consisted in an increase of dimensions, the application of a sufficient motive power, and the means of governing that motive power from within. In another line, the dumb-waiter developed into the freight-elevator, operated first by hand, and later by water-power or steam-power. The freight-elevator, however, was too heavy, clumsy, and slow, to be used for passengers. The real passenger elevator has been in use only a com-

paratively short time, but in that time it has proved its worth so far as to render possible such structures as the *Tribune* and *Times* buildings in New York, and the monstrous edifices that have gone up, or are going up, in the city of Chicago.

The speed at which elevators are, or may be run, depends, of course, in the first place on the amount of power employed. It also depends on the distance to be traversed; for, where the distance is short, there is less time to get up head-way. In ordinary office buildings, the speed is about 300 feet a minute, which is scarcely at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. A journey to the moon, in this way, would take about eight years, travelling day and night, Sundays and holidays included. But elevators have not yet been built quite so tall as that.

The elevators in the Union Trust Company's building, New York city, are capable of making from 600 to 900 feet a minute, provided the load be not over 3000 pounds. In a shaft 250 feet high a speed of 1500 feet a minute, which is equivalent to a mile in about $3\frac{1}{2}$ minutes, may be attained, but to most people the sensation experienced during the acceleration and the slowing up, either in ascending or descending, is far from agreeable. With the improvements made quite recently in the running-gear, and in the means of guarding against accidents, it is just as safe to run fast as slow. The Masonic Temple, now in course of erection in Chicago, will have twenty-four elevators, built around a circular shaft, and having a rise of 250 feet. Some of them will be used as express elevators, going the whole distance, up or down, without a stop, but the maximum speed will probably not be attempted, for the reason given above. Others will stop at every fourth or fifth landing; others, at every landing; finally, others will be used exclusively for freight.

The largest elevator cars in the world are said to be those of the North Hudson County Railway, at Weehawken, opposite New York City, on the Hudson. Three separate elevators are provided, each of which is intended to carry 135 passengers, the weight of whom, says the report, is equal to 10 tons. This would give an average of 148 pounds to each person. We thought New Yorkers were bigger than that. A viaduct, 875 feet long, reaches out from the hill to a point 150 feet above the ferry-house, whence rises the shaft, thus sparing the passengers a long and toilsome climb, and a climb is always up-hill work.

THE RAMIE FIBRE ONCE MORE.

Some time ago, we said a word about the ramie fibre as a substitute for iron in the manufacture of steam-pipes. No further developments have been made public in this direction; but a few notes, in part from the *Pacific Lumberman*, about its employment in the manufacture of cloth, may be useful—perhaps interesting.

The experiments were made at the woollen mills of San José, Cali-

foria. The fibre was put through the same processes as any other material used in the manufacture of cloth. It went through the picking, carding, roping, and spinning machines, from which it came forth thread. Next, it went through a special machine by which a thread of ramie and a thread of wool were twisted into one. This compound thread, says the statement, was then put into the loom and turned into cloth. It would seem from this, that the thread was used both as web and filling, though this is not clearly stated. The fabric was strong, and so compact that when held up, light could not be seen through it.

Ramie is said to be more than forty times as strong as cotton; hence, it is evident that a fabric made of mixed wool and ramie must be far superior to the ordinary mixture of wool and cotton. The fibre, when prepared for use, has a creamy white color, and almost a silken lustre, which it retains even after the process of dyeing. It looks better, and wears better, than any other fabric, except perhaps silk, and can be produced at a very much lower price. In the light of these facts, we have asked ourselves why the fibre should not be used pure, without admixture of wool or anything else, and we confess that we are still waiting for an answer.

The cultivation of ramie is of the easiest description. It grows with the prolificness of a weed, and seems to thrive best in a soil which is too poor for any other crop; the climate, however, of our northern States is too cold for it; but in the southern States it will give three crops a year, at a profit of at least \$200 an acre, and one planting will last twenty years. We venture to predict that, in the near future, the cultivation of ramie will be undertaken on a large scale, and that King Cotton will have to abdicate and give place to King Ramie.

MOTIVE POWER AT THE WORLD'S FAIR.

According to the *Electrical Review*, the chief motive power for the machinery at the World's Fair will be supplied by a gigantic engine, to be furnished free to the Exposition by the E. P. Allis Company, of Milwaukee. The engine will be furnished as a part of the company's exhibit, upon a special contract providing that it shall be used for the motive power, *and that no other engine of equal size shall be exhibited.* We confess that we do not quite understand how the second part of this contract can be valid. Who gives, or can give, to the managers of the World's Fair the right to discriminate between individuals as to their exhibits? The only possible valid reason why another firm should not be allowed to put in a larger engine would be because it had failed to make application for space before the time-limit for such application had expired. In that case, the clause we have italicized would be useless. Anyhow, it is to be an engine of the quadruple-expansion type, and is to be of about 4000 horse-power.

Quadruple-expansion? what is it? Well, when steam is admitted into

the cylinder of an engine, in virtue of its pressure it forces the piston to move forward. If the supply of steam is cut off, as it always ought to be, before the piston has reached the end of its stroke, the steam already admitted will expand and continue to urge the piston forward, though, of course, with decreasing force. In doing work, that is, in driving the piston forward against resistance, the steam loses some of its heat, but this loss should not be enough to cause it to be condensed into water, for water, being incompressible, is a dangerous nuisance in a steam cylinder. While the piston is returning, on its back-stroke, the steam which caused the forward stroke must be got rid of. What entered as steam must therefore be expelled again as steam, but at a lower temperature, and at a reduced pressure. Now, if this be allowed to escape into the air, it is so much heat lost, and therefore so much coal lost. Millions of dollars are wasted in this way every year. Some of this heat-energy may, however, be saved by making the exhaust-steam heat the feed-water for the boiler. An engine, in which steam thus acts on one piston, and is then allowed to escape, is called a *single-expansion* engine.

But better results may be obtained by causing the steam which has already acted on one piston to pass on to a second cylinder and have a whack at *its* piston. Here the steam is at a lower pressure, and consequently, to be effective, it must have a larger surface on which to act. The second cylinder must, therefore, be larger than the first. An engine built on these lines is called a *double-expansion* engine, and by its use a very great saving may sometimes be made. If again, we allow the exhaust-steam of the second cylinder to expand into a third one, we have the *triple-expansion* engine, and another similar step brings us to the one of *quadruple-expansion*.

At each stage there should be a saving; and by the time the steam leaves the last cylinder it should be so far used up as to have only just enough energy left to get out of the way. All the pistons in an engine of any one type work together, and, with the cylinders, valves, etc., constitute but one engine. These *multiple-expansion* engines are fast replacing the older type, especially in the case of large plants; and, in them we have probably nearly reached the limit of what is possible with the fuel-water-steam engine.

We have said that the Allis engine for the World's Fair is of the *quadruple-expansion* type, and that it is rated at about 4000 horse-power. This means that it could lift, against gravity, 66,000 tons, or from 20 to 25 of the largest light-houses of the world, at the rate of one foot a minute, or, in other words, could raise that weight more than a quarter of a mile in 24 hours. The great Corliss engine, used at the Centennial Exposition was not half so powerful.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, HIS LIFE AND HIS WORK. By *Charles Kendall Adams*, LL.D. New York, 1892.

"At the northwest corner of the Italian peninsula the coast-line, as it approaches the French border, bends around to the west in such a way as to form a kind of rounded angle, which, according to the fertile fancy of the Greeks, resembled the human knee. It was probably in recognition of this geographical peculiarity that the hamlet established at this point received some centuries before the Christian era the name which has since been evolved into Genoa." When Dr. Adams wrote these two sentences,—the opening sentences of his book,—he was the President of Cornell University. We quote him in recognition of his literary peculiarities, and, at this point, to establish the fact that one may write English clumsily and cloudily, and yet be evolved into a University President.

Within a twelve-month a crowd of poor writers have fallen foul of Christopher Columbus. As an excuse for their dull books, they charge Washington Irving with having written too well. A man who writes well cannot be scientific, say the presidents, professors, librarians of the universities; therefore *We* are pre-eminently scientific historians. And besides, Irving was a man of feeling, of perception, who could understand a great man. No scientific historian should be able to enter into the soul of any human being; hence Irving was lamentably unscientific. A splendid apology for dulness, incompetence, dryness, these university men have evolved.

Dull and dry as Dr. Adams is, he is more reliable than some others who enviously seek to belittle Irving. The ex-president's book, one can see, was written solely because a publisher invited him to turn out a volume in a speculative series. And the publisher invited the Doctor to write, not because he had anything new to say about Columbus, but because he was, at the time, President of a University. Now that he is an ex-president his book has a value, as a curiosity.

About Columbus, his life and his work, worse books have been written. A critical historian would not have said all that Doctor Adams says; for he says, occasionally, what he cannot substantiate; and a truthful historian would have said more than the Doctor says, for his analytic and synthetic powers are very limited. He repeats a story often told—repeats it lifelessly, school-boy fashion. Having no imagination the author is at the mercy of his plain, little—red—school-house self. Had he a proper training, it is evident that he could edit a classical author; but for picturing, measuring live men, Dr. Adams is not fitted.

Of the history of the fifteenth century the ex-president knows very little; of the history of Spain during the fifteenth century he knows less. He has written a book which the publishers meant to be "popular." It is in fact a school-boy's book that school-boys will not read. Irving, considering his time and his prejudices, gave us a rarely good life of the discoverer of America. Dr. Adams has not done better.

The *true* life of Columbus has been written. Unless time uncovers documents that are hidden, a *complete* life of the great man cannot be written; but the details that we lack are of little importance, if we except one fact now made over-much of,—his second marriage. The discoverer of the New World needs no defence other than that which the

truth of history offers; and in our October number, THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW intends to contrast the Columbus of history with the Columbus of the recent universalists, so that seekers after truth may know the truth, and avoid the false.

PHASES OF THOUGHT AND CRITICISM. By *Brother Azarias*. Houghton, Mifflin & Company: Boston and New York. 1892.

A new book by Brother Azarias means a new pleasure, a new friend; thoughtful friend, learned, wise and wholly devoted to our welfare. Hence it is that we welcome each new book of the studious, earnest Brother of the Christian Schools, who has been untiring in his efforts to spread sound principles among a loose-thinking generation. In "Phases of Thought and Criticism," we have a handbook of the science of right-thinking; and an exemplar of the higher literary criticism, which, dealing only with masterpieces, analyses, criticisms, not beauties or defects of form, but the soul of the artist, the ideals that inspire him, the lesson that he teaches.

To the first eighty-eight pages of the "Phases," we apply the title: "Handbook of the science of right-thinking." Here the philosophic author considers, first of all, the soul and its activities; and next, "thinking,"—what it is, what it is not; the "principle" of thought; the "habit" of right-thinking; the influence of our pursuits upon our habits of thought. Apt illustration enforces the principles enunciated; and the value of the thought of many noted teachers, ancient and modern, is justly estimated. Happily has Brother Azarias chosen Emerson and Newman, as subjects for a chapter, in which, giving us "a glimpse of the inner chambers of the mind" of a thinker, whose limitations were narrow, and whose training was most imperfect, we are enabled, by comparison, to appreciate duly the great Englishman, whose breadth of mind, acuteness, logical force, and passion for truth assure him a lasting and deserved fame.

The "ideal in thought,"—the reality of the ideal, the importance of the ideal to the perfection of all the arts, true realism, the delusions of the "School of Realism,"—these subjects of so great importance to the student of literature and to the writer, are clearly and agreeably handled by our eminent Catholic thinker, whose work has been ever inspired by the highest of ideals. The "ideal" implies the supernatural, the spiritual, the moral; and these again imply the higher life, the spiritual life. No true spiritual life, says Brother Azarias, without the cultivation of the "Spiritual Sense," noblest of the soul's "activities";—for the Spiritual Sense "takes in all the truth, goodness and beauty, of both the natural and revealed orders, and views them in the light of Faith." To aid a reader in cultivating the Spiritual Sense, and to show how all great thinkers are great only in as much as they have cultivated the Spiritual Sense, our author here analyses and criticises three of the world's masterpieces: the *Imitation of Christ*, the *Divina Commedia*, and the *In Memoriam*.

You have read the *Imitation*, and perhaps you have read a biography of the author, Thomas à Kempis. And yet even after close study of the book and the man, Brother Azarias will give you a better understanding of the one and the other. The man is limned in the book; the book is the man. And the man was not merely a spiritual man but also a man of learning and a literary artist. The ideal and scope of the *Imitation*, the sources from which it was drawn, the line of thought, the fitness of the expression, 'the secret of the magic influence' of the

book, are patiently studied and serviceably, admirably explained. From "Phases of Thought" many will learn, for the first time, how great an artist as well as thinker was Thomas à Kempis.

From the work of a religious who wrote calmly in a solitary's cell, we turn now to "a work indited amid the storms of passion and tribulation, and withal bearing a deep spiritual meaning"—the *Divina Commedia*. Leo XIII., who has so often said the right word at the right time, recently directed the attention of Catholic scholars to Dante's sublime epic, which non-Catholics, infidels and indeed the most bitter enemies of the Church, wresting it from its true purpose, have used as a weapon of assault on her, and as an instrument for the dissemination of falsehood. English-speaking Catholics are almost wholly at the mercy of non-Catholic writers,—translators, annotators, explicators, critics of the Divine Comedy; and therefore we welcome Brother Azarias's study of Dante and his time, analysis of the three masterly poems on Hell, Purgatory and Paradise, and summary of the "philosophy and doctrine that are the foundation of their Spiritual Sense." The Brother's extensive reading, delicate and true perception, and simple, pleasing art of expression have never been more happily combined; and this study is bound to attract, as it deserves to attract, wide attention.

A "world-poem" our critic declares the "In Memoriam" to be. A great poem it is, certainly, and yet far below Dante's, and hardly comparable with it. Much lower in ideal, lesser in conception, weaker, smaller in execution, Tennyson's masterpiece, considering the times, the man, his surroundings, and the occasion of the poem, is worthy of the painstaking and original study for which we are indebted to Brother Azarias. The work of seventeen years,—and thus long Tennyson toiled over the "In Memoriam"—is not to be measured in a day or a week. An elegy, a poem almost wholly personal, it may be as the author of this study truly says, "not unfitly called a lyrical drama of the soul." A thinker, serious but uncertain, grasping after Truth, attaining it only in part, satisfied now with half-truth, now with falsehood,—such a thinker is Tennyson. To be able easily to trace his thought and teaching, and whence he has derived his thought, and to what goal his teaching leads; to admire the truth he has worked out of sorrow, to correct his errors, and at the same time to enjoy his exquisite art,—all this Brother Azarias has made possible. Doing this, he has made all readers and students of the poem indebted to him. The study is a scholarly piece of work of which Catholics may well be proud. Work of this character is not only immediately but also permanently useful. It is an exemplar, ever teaching students what is good work, and how they must work if they would be recognized as scholars.

LE CAPITAL, LA SPECULATION, ET LA FINANCE AU XIX. SIECLE, Par *Claudio Jannet*, Professeur d' Economie Politique a L' Institut Catholique De Paris. Librairie Plon., Paris, 1892.

Though economical questions are so freely discussed nowadays, much of the discussion is not intelligent. To have value, a judgment of the prevailing economical system, or of any part of it, should be based on a thorough acquaintance with actual conditions and actual methods. M. Claudio Jannet, always practical, has in his latest work, carefully delineated the world of finance, the world of commerce, the world of industry, just as they are. What is good in them, what is evil, he makes clear. The evil that may be and should be corrected, he points out. False theories, false inferences, he discovers. A sound scholar, sound philosopher, sound moralist, knowing the past as well as the present, he

is always the safest of guides ; and nowhere has he used to better advantage his knowledge, or more serviceably applied scientific and ethical principles, than in this volume.

Were it not for the exaggerations of the socialists and of many other "reformers," we should have less reason than we have to find fault with the existing economical order. False doctrines, misrepresentations of facts, misconceptions of all sorts, mislead great numbers of men and distract them from what is immediately desirable and possible. In the present order there is more to praise than to blame. It is not so much the mechanism that is at fault, but greedy men who abuse it, and men too careless or ignorant to use it beneficially.

The development within recent times of capital, of commerce, of manufactures, of banking, of credit, of markets, and of speculation, has been extraordinary. The wonder is that we should have so readily adapted ourselves to changes so unforeseen, so rapid. And the era of change has not come to an end ; but we shall accommodate ourselves to the future as we have to the past. The changes that have taken place have not made the rich richer and the poor poorer, as the demagogues commonly say. Increase of wealth, M. Jannet shows, has been accompanied by the dissemination of wealth, and by a general, constant elevation of the mass of men.

To the inexpert, the author's chapters on commercial and stock speculations must prove not only interesting but also instructive in many ways. The purpose and the organization of the various "Exchanges," the character of the transactions habitual there, are described in detail. How these various transactions affect prices ; which of these transactions are legitimate, moral ; which are illegitimate, immoral, M. Jannet explains. The tricks of speculators he exposes, warning the unshorn "lamb" to keep far away from the shearer. Even the most expert will find these studies valuable, covering as they do not only the methods in vogue in England, and on the Continental Exchanges, but also in the United States. M. Jannet handles and resolves many delicate questions while treating of modern speculation ; and he has written an admirable chapter on business morality ; a chapter whose illustrations are drawn from many countries. Indeed throughout the volume, facts notable, recent, abound ; and our own country furnishes the learned author with material that will be new to many readers, and that is happily chosen.

It is not many years ago since our bankers tried to pass a new proverb upon us : "A national debt is a national blessing." Blessing or not, all our modern governments have acted very much as if they accepted the American bankers' proverb. To the social consequences of their public debts, M. Jannet devotes a chapter, wherein he discusses the character of the various loans customarily issued, showing their advantages and defects ; the improper methods that have been used in many countries, the disastrous effects of these methods, the profits, tricks, connivances of the combinations of great bankers who control these loans, as well as of public officials who devise them. Every intelligent man, whatever his calling, would be served by reading this chapter. Democracies have been exploited by clever men, just as kingdoms and empires. Citizens who are informed can do something to protect themselves and the country. If we are content to be ignorant, we must be satisfied with suffering and groaning.

The financial and political power of the great banking interest in this nineteenth century, few give a thought to. The voter is an uncertain factor, the financier is a certain, positive factor, whom it is well to

know. And M. Jannet has pictured him to us, in his great exemplar, the Rothschild, ruler of States. With his house in the lead, it is the Jews who finance the world. Their power and how they use it, their wonderful organization, the marvellous intelligence, foresight, they have displayed in meeting all the developments of new political and economical conditions, the problems they have made for us, and their moral standards—all these, the Professor of Political Economy at the Paris Institute, has presented with abundance of fact, carefully, moderately.

M. Jannet's work is up to the times in every respect, and must find a place in the library of every economist, professor and student. Bankers, brokers, manufacturers, tradesmen will be served by it. To theologians, students of ethics, students of history, it will be welcome. The scope of the work is large, and the plan most original. Catholics have laid on them to-day a special duty: to know the moral principles determining all the various operations of business, to practice those principles, and to spread a knowledge of them far and wide. If we are to be saved from worse things, preserve peace, allay the spirit of socialistic revolution, elevate society—there is only one way. M. Claudio Jannet points the way. How long shall we have to wait for a body of American workers, who, following his methods, shall endeavor to raise the standard of economical education among all classes of our people?

DIE GOTTGEWEIHTEN JUNGFRÄUEN IN DEN ERSTEN JAHRHUNDERTEN DER KIRCHE:
von *Joseph Wilpert*. B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

The united talents of one of the most distinguished of Christian archaeologists and of one of the princes of Catholic publishers have given us in this charming book, magnificently printed and illustrated, the very gem of recent Catholic literature. Mgr. Wilpert, writing as a labor of love a work for the edification of the nuns of his beloved Innsbruck, has chosen for his subject what De Rossi has very neatly and correctly designated "*il fiore dell' archeologia Cristiana*," that of "consecrated virgins in the first centuries of the Church." The subject has also the charm of novelty; for this interesting topic had been but meagrely treated.

The brilliant young writer has brought to bear upon his task the manifold talents of pen and pencil with which God has blessed him in an eminent degree. In addition to the folios of the Fathers, he has gleaned much valuable information from the frescoes, inscriptions and monuments of the Catacombs; and he has invested what in inferior hands might have been a dry antiquarian dissertation, with that interest which only one thoroughly master of his subject and in deep sympathy with the institution which he describes can impart.

The work is divided into two sections. In the first, the author's intimate acquaintance with early Christian literature enables him to present a most graphic and fascinating picture of the holy nuns of the first ages; the deep veneration in which they were held; their vow of perpetual virginity and the ceremonies attending their entering upon the consecrated state; their dress and canonical age; their rule of life; the development of religious communities; and, lastly, the noble reward which, in the estimation of all Christians, awaited them in heaven.

The second section of the work is devoted to the reproduction and explanation of frescoes and other remains of primitive Christian art bearing upon the subject. The accompanying plates are of exceptional excellence; the first especially well deserving De Rossi's encomium that

"it is the best copy of a painting in the Catacombs which has yet appeared."

One rises from a perusal of Wilpert's book with increased veneration for that loveliest of Christian institutions, perpetual chastity. Were there no other evidence at hand of the identity of the great Catholic Church of to-day with the Church of Cyprian, Jerome and Augustine, their common reverence for virginity and the number of consecrated "brides of Christ," who in all ages have renounced the allurements of wealth and rank to lead lives of voluntary poverty and chastity would be quite sufficient to prove that the Church ever remains guided by the same Unchanging Spirit. Now, as in the days of Cyprian, these holy women who have bound themselves voluntarily and joyfully to lives of perpetual chastity are regarded as "God's image answering to the holiness of the Lord, the most illustrious portion of Christ's flock."¹

We hope that the enterprise of Herder will not allow this valuable work to serve for the edification and consolation of Germans only. It ought, without delay, to be translated into English, that its sphere of usefulness may be extended. Our religious women, though amply supplied with ascetical and devotional works, are badly in need of just such productions as this of Wilpert, which appeal directly to the understanding; and as our excellent Sisters are by training and habit of a literary bent, such appeals to their reasoning powers are the most powerful means of awakening their devotion.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Father Matteo Liberatore, S. J.* Translated by Edward Heneage Dering. London Art and Book Company. 1891. Received from Benziger & Co.

Old age has nowise dulled the keen intellect of Liberatore; though it is touching to read the passage where he intimates a doubt of his being left to finish even this little book. The value of the work is not to be measured by its size; its chief merit is that it points out the true path to younger feet. Of all modern sciences, political economy needed just such a teacher as the veteran Catholic philosopher who, in the school of St. Thomas, had grown gray in pondering the right use of words. The very definition of the science had been left vague and unsatisfactory. The first care of Liberatore, therefore, is to subject every term used to a vigorous inspection; and, half the time, when terms are rightly understood, every difficulty has vanished. After defining his subject to be "the science of public wealth, with regard to its rightful ordering as a means of common well-being," he adopts the usual division under the three heads of the production, distribution and consumption of wealth. He reduces the producers of wealth to two, viz., nature and the labor of man. Capital he defines to be "a store of savings, destined for production"; it is not a producer of wealth, rather the effect of production; it is a powerful instrument in the hands of the true producer.

Liberatore insists throughout upon the supremacy of morality over this science of wealth and upon the dignity of man as a moral agent. "Political economy," he says, "is not the science of multiplying wealth anyhow. Were it so, fraud, robbery and the pillage of the conquered would have to be included among its means." He is equally indignant that the laborer should be degraded to the category of machinery.

"Work, or the production of wealth, is not the end for which the workman lives. He works to live, and whoever says that he lives to

¹ St. Cyprian On the Dress of Virgins, c. 3.

work likens him to a machine, or, at the most, a brute." He demands that remedies be speedily found to obviate, or at least diminish, the evils caused to the liberty and intelligence of workmen by present economic conditions, the minute subdivision of labor and the use of machinery. The operative is entitled to previous instruction and education. "No child should be put to permanent mechanical work until his bodily strength is developed and sufficiently consolidated by age, and his mind by instruction, most especially in morals and religion." Secondly he urges: "Limit the hours of labor, not only for women and children, who ought not to work more than six hours, but also for adults. In no factory should the operative work more than nine, or, at most, ten hours in the day; so that he may have leisure for the cares and affections of home, and raise his thoughts to things befitting the dignity of human nature. But, above all, his freedom to abstain from material work on Sundays and holidays ought to be kept intact in order that he may have time and opportunity to fulfil his religious duties and strengthen his good resolutions."

Such a doctrine, while it undoubtedly "will not be acceptable to the sense-worshippers and self-worshippers, who find in human society nothing higher than wealth, to be produced anyhow in the highest possible quantity, and see in the operative nothing more than a machine, to which indeed they compare him in their treatises,"—will appear self-evident to all who really believe in the common brotherhood of men and the priceless dignity of immortal souls.

We should like to see this book in the hands of all our young men, that they may be persuaded that Christianity alone, and Catholic Christianity at that, is the only disinterested friend of the people. In Liberator they will find an admirable commentator upon Pope Leo's encyclical, "On the Condition of Labor."

DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN. An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions. By *George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.* Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 1892.

This volume, the author tells us, "is devoted to the general theory of organic evolution as left by the stupendous labors of Darwin." To the believing Christian, the most interesting pages are those which contain the author's views as to the bearings of "science" on religion. It is consoling to observe that his researches have failed to offer him the slightest evidence that mankind have been mistaken in ascribing the creation and government of the world to a personal, intelligent and beneficent God. That God is a mysterious and incomprehensible being was well known and proclaimed ages ago. We do not ask modern science to furnish us with new arguments to prove His existence, much less do we look to scientists for an explanation of the divine attributes. We are satisfied if they will have the humility to confess with Professor Romanes, that "while the sphere of science is necessarily restricted to that of natural causation, which it is her office to explore, the question touching the *nature of this natural causation* is one which as necessarily lies without the whole sphere of such causation itself; therefore, it lies beyond any possible intrusion by science." It is simply due to mental cowardice that "scientists" stop short when their microscope fails them, and refuse to follow the clear vision of reason into the region of things invisible. The learned author is wrong when he insinuates that there is no supplement to physical science except faith; for, besides faith, there is the solid ground of metaphysics. However, we repeat that it is a great consolation to find so devoted a follower of Darwin

and so distinguished a leader of the evolutionists as this Oxford professor undoubtedly is, conceding to simple-minded men, that for aught he knows to the contrary, God still rules the universe. There is something pathetic, akin to a wail, in his concluding sentences: "But I have endeavored to show that the logical standing of the case"—for the existence of a supreme beneficent Being—"has not been materially changed; and when this cry of Reason"—the unreasonable Reason which chafes at mysteries—"pierces the heart of Faith, it remains for Faith to answer now, as she has always answered before—and answered with that trust which is at once her beauty and her life—Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." With a little more faith in his own reasoning powers and less slavish dependence upon his microscope the able author would soon reason himself into Christianity. It is only the superficially educated "scientists" who have the hardihood to glory in their ignorance of the highest of scientific truths.

IGNAZ VON DÖLLINGER; EINE CHARACTERISTIK. Von Dr. Emil Michael, S. J.; Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch, 1892.

The purpose which the able professor of church history in the University of Innsbruck set before him in writing this book was to allow the historical Döllinger to pass judgment upon the mythical hero whom the enemies of Holy Church have been substituting for him. What a noble personage that mythical Döllinger is! How utterly inadequate the vocabulary of adulation to sound his praises! He is the very Prometheus of modern culture in his bold defiance of the papal Jupiter! The thunder and lightning of the Vatican roar and blaze about his hoary head with impotent fury. There he stands where truth and knowledge and conscience had planted him: *Döllingerus contra mundum!* Sublime, if true. We should have been more likely to be carried away by such rhetoric if it had not grown stale by long usage. But was there ever a heretic since the days of the Apostles who was not characterized by his deluded followers in precisely the same manner! There seems to be just enough of diabolical depravity infused into the tainted blood of fallen humanity to make us always prone to resist authority and to sympathize with rebellion. Yet heresiarchs of all generations, from Simon Magus and Arius to Luther and Döllinger, preserve the same unmistakable type—an overweening self-conceit, a sublime disregard of consistency, a calm assumption of personal infallibility, a boundless contempt for the living rulers of Holy Church and utter unscrupulousness in all their charges and assertions.

Beginning at the beginning, Dr. Michael, with admirable analytical skill, traces the downward course of the unfortunate Döllinger from his promising youth to his wretched old age, bestowing with due impartiality blame and praise. In his first section, *Internal Revolt*, the author points out the gradations through which Döllinger, the Infallibilist of 1838, was metamorphosed into the venomous *Janus* of 1869. Then follows the sorrowful *Open Rebellion*, then the breaking up of "Old Catholicism," until the unhappy career ends in *Isolation*. It is, indeed, a doleful story which no charitable heart can follow without a pang, and the story is told by a man whose spirit is as kindly as his analysis is merciless.

It speaks well for the ability and the opportuneness of the study that the first edition was exhausted at its very appearance. Let it soon appear in an English dress.

RITUS ORDINATIONIS JUXTA PONTIFICALE ROMANUM. Curante Adm. *Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, D.D., LL.D.*, Olim in Seminario Provinciali apud Trojam, N. Y. Sacrae Liturgiæ Professore. Editio Secunda, Correcta et Ampliata. Cum Appendice. Impensis Bibliothecæ Cathedralis, Neo Eboracensis, Madison Avenue, 460.

The Rite of Ordination, According to the Roman Pontifical. By the Very Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, D.D., LL.D., formerly Professor of Sacred Liturgy in St. Joseph's Provincial Seminary, Troy, N. Y. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. With Appendix. The Cathedral Library Association, 460 Madison Avenue, N. Y. 1892.

The Latin text, mentioned above, and the English translation of it are bound together in one volume, each page of the Latin text being followed by a corresponding page of the English translation.

This most useful and important work is published with the approval of the Very Rev. Dionysius J. McMahon, Theological Censor of Books, confirmed by the declaration of the Most Rev. Michael Augustine Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, that this translation of "The Rite of Ordination, according to the Roman Pontifical, having been found to agree with the original, can be published by the Cathedral Library Association."

The work, as its title indicates, contains full and detailed directions, as well as the full and complete text (both in Latin and in English) of the ceremonies for the Making of Clerics, the Ordination of Pastors, of Readers, of Exorcists, of Acolytes, of Sub-Deacons, of Deacons, and of Priests.

To candidates for the priesthood preparing for ordination, and also to the laity who desire to assist intelligently when they witness the impressive ceremonies, this work cannot fail to be highly useful.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR, COLLECTED FROM DIFFERENT SPIRITUAL WRITERS AND SUITED FOR THE PRACTICE CALLED "QUARTER OF AN HOUR'S SOLITUDE." Edited by *Rev. Roger Baxter, S. J.*, of Georgetown College. Second edition. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1892.

"This book (the editor tells us), was first written in Latin, in 1639, by N. B. (an English Religious), and handed around in manuscript for years, during the times of persecution in England, where it was used by many holy persons. It was translated into English in 1669 by Rev. E. Mico and revised and modernized in 1822 by Rev. Roger Baxter, S. J., of Georgetown College." The work, then, is doubly precious. It is precious for its own sake and again for its antiquity. Of this book it may be truly said, "though old, it is ever new." In our humble esteem it is the equal, we had almost said the superior, of any work of the kind now in use. In the preface to the first American edition, the editor tells us the book was a particular favorite with such men as Bishops Challoner and Walmsley. That alone were highest recommendation for any work. We warmly recommend this little book to all and wish it the splendid success its high value calls for.

GOLDEN RULES FOR DIRECTING RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES, SEMINARIES, COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, FAMILIES, ETC. By *Rev. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R.* A new and revised edition. Fr. Pustet, Printer to the Holy See and the S. Congregation of Rites. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This is a new edition of an old and highly prized work. The writer, Rev. Michael Müller, C.S.S.R., is well known and deservedly held in great esteem in the Catholic community, for he is the author of many other most excellent books. Whilst primarily intended for the Superiors

of Religious Houses, it will, we are sure, be appreciated by, and prove most valuable to all in authority. To the priest in the confessional, and the pastor in the direction of his people, it is alike invaluable. It is, moreover, a book that should be in the hands of Catholic parents, first for their own sake, and secondly for the sake of the children, whom God has placed in their keeping. We have every hope that this new edition will be favorably received and appreciated by English speaking Catholics.

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION AND ON THE HIDDEN AND PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By *The Most Rev. Dr. Kirby*, Archbishop of Ephesus. Rector of the Irish College at Rome. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1892.

This is a book intended primarily for the clergy and ecclesiastical students. It is a development or explanation of the "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius." It is indeed more than a development of those admirable "Exercises," for whilst drawing the matter and order of his meditations from the "Exercises," the Most Rev. author has given them a new and most practical value by his happy and learned applications of Scripture texts. We like very much the author's references to the Blessed Virgin.

Every priest should have this book on his desk. It will be largely instrumental to his own sanctification, and of invaluable assistance to him in his high office of preaching and directing souls.

FASTI MARIANI: Sive Calendarium Festorum Sanctæ Mariæ Virginis Deiparæ, memoriis historicis illustratum: auctore *F. G. Holweck*. Friburgi: Herder. Price, \$2, net.

This slender volume aims at giving a comprehensive survey of all the festivals established among Christians, as well in the Holy Catholic Church as in the schismatic churches of the East. The meaning, origin and time of establishment are succinctly narrated under each day, following the order of the calendar. The work is an expansion of articles which appeared in 1888 in our excellent contemporary, the "Pastoralblatt" of St. Louis, to which diocese the learned author belongs. He has given the clergy a very valuable and instructive book, conveying a mass of information not easily accessible.

A MARTYR OF OUR OWN TIMES. Life of Rev. Just de Bretenières, Missionary Apostolic, Martyred in Corea in 1866. From the French of *Rt. Rev. Mgr. D'Hulst*, Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris. Edited by Very Rev. J. R. Slattery, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary. Baltimore, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

The subject of this biography, along with Mgr. Berniex and two other Catholic missionaries, joyfully suffered martyrdom on the 8th of March, 1866, in Corea. The early evidences he gave of his possessing a true vocation for the priesthood; his life and employments at St. Sulpice, and at the seminary of Foreign Missions; his voyage to Corea, the trials and hardships he endured; his indefatigable zeal and his heroic death, are well described in the volume before us.

THE CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. By *Lelia Hardin Bugg*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

We sincerely wish that a copy of this most useful little work were in the hands of every Catholic in our country and were carefully read by him or

her. It consists of brief, plain, practical directions as to what is the correct thing for Catholics to do, and not to do, under almost all conceivable circumstances—at Confession, Holy Communion, Confirmation, at funerals, respecting marriage engagements, at weddings, at church, during Lent, during Holy Week, when visiting convents or clergymen, etc. The book is, for the purpose for which it is intended, one of the very best works that we know of.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE CATACOMBS. By *Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America, Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

We cannot too highly commend this unpretentious but excellent little volume. In brief space it conveys a great amount of information respecting the silent, but clear and conclusive, testimony borne by the inscriptions and other monumental evidences in the catacombs to the veneration rendered by Christians of the earliest ages to the Holy Mother of God. The work is not prepared primarily for learned scholars, but rather for the general public to whom the results of modern scientific research on the subject are not easily accessible.

A SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

This neat little volume of 254 pages is splendidly illustrated and written in a highly interesting style. Large or small, it is one of the best Catholic histories of the United States that has yet appeared, and so far from dealing with only a few important events it is remarkably complete. It is admirably adapted to every grade in our parochial schools.

SOUVENIR SKETCH OF ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA. HARDY & MAHONY. 1892.

This little book was written by *Rev. Wm. Kieran, D.D.*, the learned rector of St. Patrick's congregation, as a memento of the golden jubilee of his grand old parish. The story of its fifty years of existence is exceedingly well told and the book is well illustrated. It would greatly facilitate the work of future historians of the Catholic Church in America, if all our pastors would issue similar memorial volumes.

HORÆ DIURNÆ BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Editio secunda post typicum. Fr. Pustet: Ratisbon and New York. 1892. Price, \$5.

No pains have been spared to make this really superb, large octavo edition of the little hours perfect in every respect. It will be very acceptable to those of the clergy whose advancing years and diminishing keenness of vision forbid the further use of small print.

MISSALE ROMANUM. Quarto edition. Pustet & Co: Ratisbon and New York. 1892.

In this sixth reproduction of the *editio typica* the latest Masses will all be found in their proper places, dispensing with the great inconvenience of loose leaves and dislocated feasts.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

MANIFESTATION OF CONSCIENCE. CONFESSIONS AND COMMUNIONS IN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES. A Commentary on the decree "Quemadmodum" of December 17, 1890. Translated from the French of Rev. *Pie de Longogne, O. M. Cap.* With the original decree and the official translation. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. From the Spanish of *F. de P. Capella*. Olive and Other Tales, from the French. The Father's Right Hand, and Nannie's Heroism. The Bric-a-Brac Dealer, from the French. Benziger Brothers; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

FIFTY-TWO SHORT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF OUR HOLY RELIGION. From the French, by Rev. Thomas F. Ward, Rector of the Church of St. Charles Borromeo, Brooklyn N. Y. Benziger Brothers: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Charles Gide*, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Montpellier, France. Translated by Edward Percy Jacobson. With an introduction by James Bonar, M.A., LL.D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

THE STATE. ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL POLITICS. A Sketch of Institutional History and Administration. By *Woodrow Wilson*, Ph.D., LL.D., Author of "Congressional Government." Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1892.

ELEMENTS OF CHEMISTRY, DESCRIPTIVE AND QUALITATIVE. By *James H. Shepard*, Professor of Chemistry, South Dakota Agricultural College, and Chemist to the United States Experiment Station, South Dakota. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

COLUMBUS, THE GREAT DISCOVERER OF AMERICA. A Drama in Five Acts. By an Ursuline. (Dedicated to the Right Rev. I. F. Horstman, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland.) New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Charles S. Devas*, Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland, Author of "Groundwork of Economics," etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THE BIRTHDAY BOOK OF THE MADONNA. Compiled by Vincent O'Brien, Editor of "The Birthday Book of the Sacred Heart." Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

THE LITTLE BOG-TROTTERS; or, A FEW DAYS AT CONMORE. By *Rosa Mulholland*. With Numerous Illustrations. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

MY ZOUAVE. By *Mrs. Bartle Teeling*, Author of "Roman Violets," etc. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

ADELAIDE, QUEEN OF ITALY; or, THE IRON CROWN. An Historical Tale. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co.

FLORINE, PRINCESS OF BURGUNDY. A Tale of the First Crusade. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co. 1892.

THE STOLEN CHILD. By *Henrick Conscience*. Translated from the original Flemish. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

STUDIES IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Mary Sheldon Barnes* and *Earl Barnes*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1891.

HISTORISCHES JAHRBUCH IM AUFTRAGE DER GORRES-GESELLSCHAFT. Munich. 1892. April number.

THE AMERICAN CITIZEN. By *F. Dole*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVII.—OCTOBER, 1892.—No. 68.

THE CATHOLIC IDEA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

WHAT we mean by the "Catholic Idea" we have explained in an article on "The Catholic Idea in Prophecy," in the April number of the REVIEW, and in another on "The Hierarchy in the First Two Centuries" in the number for July. We have proved that the Christianity prefigured and foretold in the Old Testament, and which is Historical Christianity, is a religion representing and embodying the Catholic idea.

Christianity being the true, the revealed, the divine religion, whose origin is coeval with the existence of mankind on the earth from the beginning to the end of time, its ideal form must be in the New Testament, its most precious document, precisely the same as in prophecy and history. It is, however, important and even necessary to give distinct and separate proof that the Catholic idea is in the New Testament. For, there is a numerous Christian sect, professing to have the pure evangelical and apostolic doctrine, immediately from the New Testament, which totally rejects and denies the Catholic Idea as of alien and human origin.

From their own interpretation of the New Testament as their standpoint, they take a view of ecclesiastical history both before and after Christ which harmonizes with their notion of pure and spiritual religion. The hierarchical, ritual and legal elements of pre-Christian religion are cast aside as obsolete, and the predictions of the prophets concerning the Christian Church are allegorized away. The post-apostolic historical Christianity is represented as an alteration and corruption of the genuine ideal presented in the New Testament. They profess to have gone back to this ideal, and to have restored the pure, primitive Christianity of Christ and the Apostles in conformity with it.

VOL. XVII.—43

Their conception of Christianity is derived from a false mysticism, an exaggerated spiritualism, which is a counterfeit of the true, genuine mystical theology of contemplative saints in the Catholic Church. The famous book "*Theologia Germanica*" was Luther's favorite manual of spiritual doctrine. Its author was a Catholic, and the book may be interpreted in an orthodox sense, although its vagueness and obscurity made it easily susceptible of being turned to the service of heresy.

The false mysticism in question separates the spirit from the body of the Christian religion, abjuring the sacramental, sacerdotal, hierarchical, ritual, and properly ecclesiastical constitution of the Catholic Church as a superadded structure of human origin and invention. Its most perfect expression is exhibited in Puritanism. A collection of professing believers, regarding themselves as the elect of God, meet together in a building which is not a church but a meeting-house, for extemporaneous prayer, singing of hymns, reading the Bible and preaching. They have elders appointed by themselves to preside over the meeting. They have, indeed, quite inconsistently, baptism and the "Lord's Supper," but they deny their true sacramental character. They have neither priest, altar sacrifice, liturgy, nor anything symbolic and beautiful in the way of ceremonial worship. They think that this was the way of the primitive, apostolic Christians. The Bible, especially the New Testament, they declare to be their only rule of faith, and they profess to find therein their own peculiar form of religious doctrine and practice.

In point of fact, this idea of religion is not only without any foundation in the Old Testament, but it is not to be found in the New Testament. Those who make the profession of taking the New Testament as their rule of faith do not really take it as a whole for their guide, but only certain misinterpreted parts of it, overlooking and neglecting the rest.

It is for them like a palimpsest, a codex which has been written over by a new composition of their own invention, which allows only isolated passages to appear under their superscription, spots of the original text, surrounded by foreign and incongruous writing. Or, to adopt another simile, it is the sacred text, accompanied by a paraphrase and commentary, which alters and perverts its true and original sense, in conformity with the new and private opinions of the commentators.

No doubt, the New Testament needs a paraphrase and a commentary to make its meaning completely and clearly intelligible to those who are reading it after such a long lapse of time since the period of the evangelists and Apostles. Those who deny that the idea which is expressed in the historical Catholic Christianity

of the post-apostolic age is found in the New Testament, make use chiefly of negative arguments. They affirm that many things contained in tradition are not contained in Scripture.

The New Testament does not contain a systematic theology, a code of ecclesiastical law, a liturgy or a ritual. It is made up of the life of Christ, a partial history of the acts of the apostles, a few epistles of circumstance mostly addressed to particular churches, and one mysterious prophetic writing. In order to know what was the constitution, doctrine, discipline and worship of the apostolic Church, to know what is pre-supposed in the writings of the New Testament, what is alluded to, hinted at, really meant by obscure, ambiguous and partial statements, a supplement is necessary. We say that Protestants read into these sacred pages their own sense. They rejoin, that we read into them the Catholic sense. This is indeed true, in respect to all those parts which are not in and by themselves explicit and self-interpreting. But, we read into them the sense which we derive from a coeval tradition, the sense of the nearest disciples of the inspired writers, the sense of their earliest and most authentic interpreters, explaining and elucidating apostolic text by apostolic tradition, illustrating the words of the apostles by their acts, impressed upon primitive history and the general Catholic consciousness of the first Christian generations. The exposition which the second, third, and fourth centuries present of the Christianity of the New Testament is a paraphrase, but it is not an alteration. It renders the sense of every part of it full, complete and harmonious, without doing violence to any sound principles and rules of exegesis and criticism.

No Protestant interpretation can do this, whether Calvinistic, rationalistic, semi-catholic, or of any intermediate stripe. Our procedure is legitimate, and it perfectly protects the divine authority of the Written Word of God. Whereas, the abandonment of the Catholic rule can only issue in the abandonment of the Sacred Scriptures as a rule of faith, and the swallowing up of all dogmatic Christianity by the quicksand of skepticism.

It is necessary to guard against the supposition that the entire New Testament is obscure and ambiguous until it is interpreted by tradition. All the principal Catholic dogmas, and the principles of the sacramental and ecclesiastical discipline of the Church are contained in the New Testament in a clear and explicit manner, and can be proved by an exegesis of the text.

They are not there in a systematic order, as in a catechism or text-book. Therefore, the ordinary reader requires the aid of some formal harmony of the gospels and exposition of the epistles in order to get a connected and complete view of their contents. They are also confirmed, more fully explicated, and illustrated by a

comparison with tradition, and by geographical, historical and doctrinal commentaries. It is the implicit teaching, the allusions to matters supposed to be well known to the readers, the underlying historical and coeval environment of the writers and readers of the sacred books, which are more or less obscure and ambiguous in the references of the text, until the explanation is furnished by tradition. And in particular it is an exact and minute description of the development and formation of the church out of its inchoate and missionary beginnings into a permanent and regular organization, of the transition from apostolic to episcopal authority, which is wanting, and can only be partially supplied by inference and hypothesis.

Where contemporary testimonies are wanting or scanty, as is particularly the case with the period between A. D. 66 and A. D. 120, we are necessarily obliged to look backward and forward of this period, and to infer from what we know of the two extremes what the middle must have been, in order to fit them at each end and join them together in a logical and historical whole. In this way we fill the gap, we bridge over the chasm. We make a judgment of what the historical development during this half-century must have been, in order to carry on the beginnings of the previous half century. And also, we infer what it really was from what grew out of it in the half-century which followed. We thus get a fair moral certainty in regard to the chief and most substantial parts of Christian doctrine and polity, and the main facts of ecclesiastical growth and historical development, during the half-century which has left so little record of its events, and we have to resort to hypothesis only to fill up the minor details of the grand outline.

A Catholic is not, indeed, obliged to grope among early records and piece together scanty bits of history in order to know what the early Church was like. We know the Catholic Church to be of divine origin, indefectible and infallible. We have her testimony to herself. We know that she has been ever the same, from St. Peter to Leo XIII., from the Council of Jerusalem to the Council of the Vatican. Still, it is interesting to us to follow what traces she has left of her earliest history; and it is necessary to do so, for the instruction of those who are seeking the truth, and the refutation of the advocates of error.

What we desire to do is to reproduce a correct view of the earliest ages of Christianity, especially that obscure portion which intervenes between the Apostles and the Apostolic Fathers—between St. Paul and St. Ignatius. This is the lurking-place into which all anti-Catholic writers, whether evangelicals or rationalists, have been gradually and irresistibly driven by the testimony of

history. Here the Lightfoots and the Renans, and the various others who attempt to reconstruct an early Christianity according to their own different fancies, find a convenient ground for their ingenious theories about the rise and progress of Catholicism. Each one invests his historical romance, Anglican, Puritan, Unitarian, or in some other form mythical, in all the colors and shades, ranging from semi-Catholicism to the boldest rationalism—fantastic structures of mist and cloud, which present a deceptive appearance of landscape. It is an important task to dispel these illusions, and to dislodge our adversaries from their ambush.

Leaving aside all half-way theories, which retain some imperfect hierarchical and liturgical concepts, we turn our attention to that idea of primitive Christianity which is common to Puritanism and rationalism, and which gives it the form of New England Congregationalism.

We may assert, confidently, that such a concept of religion was utterly unknown and impossible to the Jews and Pagans who were the first Christian converts. It could not have entered into their minds unless the Apostles had made it an essential part of their doctrinal teaching, and thoroughly swept away all previous habits of mind derived from their old religions. In this case, a reversion to these old habits, especially while the first enthusiasm remained, and during the lifetime of the disciples of the Apostles, would have been impossible. The dominant idea and character of the Christianity of the middle of the first century must have prevailed during its later period, and must have continued during the succeeding age. Wherefore, in attempting to draw a picture of this earliest Christianity we must borrow the lineaments of the later but still very early Christianity of the period of St. Clement, St. Polycarp, St. Ignatius, and St. Irenæus, with what help we can get from the scanty and obscure hints and allusions of the sacred writers.

Here, St. John the Apostle comes to our aid. He is the connecting link between the Apostles and their successors. He survived during the pontificates of St. Linus, St. Anacletus, and St. Clement. He "founded and governed all the churches of Asia," as St. Jerome informs us. He ordained Polycarp, and through him was the instructor of Irenæus. St. John gives Apostolic sanction to the whole doctrinal and hierarchical system of the second century.

In the Apocalypse, the image of the Church on earth is thrown up into the sky, and in this beautiful cloud-picture we see reflected the Church of the Catholic ideal, with its vested priests, its altar, sacrifice, incense, and monarchical episcopate. The seven golden candlesticks with their stars, the altar and the Lamb, the robed

High Priest, the twenty-four Ancients, the Angels swinging censers, and all the beautiful imagery, are not in harmony with the Puritan and Quaker ideal, but are entirely Catholic. The epistles to the angels of the seven churches show most clearly the monarchical episcopate established in Asia Minor by St. Paul and St. John, and are in perfect agreement with the epistles of St. Ignatius, which were probably written about fifteen years later.

Renan and other anti-Catholic writers refer the beginnings of hierarchical organization to the end of the first century, and especially to that part of Asia Minor afterwards included in the exarchate of Ephesus, and to the action of the apostle St. John. Rationalists, with their hypotheses of Petrine, Pauline and Johannine Christianity, will not, indeed, hesitate to affirm that all this was a change, an alteration, a human development from the original religion of Christ. But the real and sincere believers in the inspiration of the New Testament must take it as all in one piece, homogeneous throughout. They must take the doctrines, the Church, the precepts and the ordinances of Christ and the Apostles as all one and all divine, and therefore accept all that was established under the apostolic authority of St. John in Asia Minor as the carrying out of the instructions which the Lord gave to the Apostles by word of mouth or the revelations of the Holy Spirit, and of the regulations agreed upon by the common consent of the apostolic college. In the Church of Ephesus we have a model and example by which to determine the polity and doctrine of all the apostolic churches and of the Catholic Church in general during the latter half of the first century. Without leaving Ephesus or going beyond the New Testament, we can show that it is the Catholic Idea which is there exhibited.

The Church of Ephesus was founded by St. Paul, who came there about A. D. 53, and remained three years. On his journey from Macedonia to Jerusalem, he bade a solemn farewell and gave a parting charge to the Ephesian clergy and about the year 62, while a prisoner at Rome, he wrote his beautiful and wonderful Epistle to the Ephesians. This Epistle is throughout an exposition of the Catholic Idea of the Church, under two figures, as the Spouse of Christ and as the Body of Christ.

"Christ also hath loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it in the laver of water in the word of life. That He Himself might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that it may be holy and without blemish."

"[God] hath put all things under His feet and given Him to be

¹ v. 25-7, *Kenrick's Version*.

head over all the Church, which is His body, and the fulness of Him who is all in all.”¹ It is evidently of the visible, organized Church, that St. Paul speaks, for it is only a corporate society which can be called a “body.” And this appears more clearly from other passages. “Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners; but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, the chief corner-stone being Christ Jesus Himself, in whom all the building framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.”²

The unity of the Catholic Church, analogous to the unity of God, of Christ, of the Faith, and the character of this One Catholic Church as the medium of grace, justification and sanctification, are set forth by St. Paul precisely in the same manner as they were afterwards declared by St. Cyprian. “Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all.”³

“That we may grow in all things in Him, who is the head, Christ; from whom the whole body, fitted together and connected by every joint which supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of each member, maketh the increase of the body to the building of itself in love.”⁴

The hierarchical order in the Church is explicitly and distinctly mentioned as a divine institution. “Ascending on high, He led captivity captive; He gave gifts to men . . . And He gave some indeed apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and others pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ.”⁵

The whole doctrine of Catholicism is summed up in these passages. The fundamental Catholic Idea of the Christian Church and Religion is contained and expressed in this one image which represents the Church as the Body of Christ. It is the continuation of the Incarnation, it is one grand and universal Sacrament. The Divine Spirit, the Holy Spirit of God and of Jesus Christ, dwells, in and vivifies a great corporate and organic Society, the Catholic Church. This visible organic Church, over which Christ is the head, is the medium through which he imparts His revelation of truth and His sanctifying grace to individuals and exercises His saving influence upon the world. The sacraments are special channels through which special graces are imparted from the great reservoir of the Church. The priesthood is the guardian of these treasures.

¹ i., 22-3.² ii., 19-21.³ iv., 3-6.⁴ iv., 15, 16.⁵ iv., 8-12.

"Let a man so regard us as ministers of God and stewards of the mysteries of Christ," *i.e.*, the revealed truths, the sacraments, and other Christian ordinances.¹

The hierarchy in the Church was established in order to secure unity, to keep order and discipline, to hand down the sacerdotal gifts conferred on the Apostles, to provide for valid and lawful administration of sacraments, to preserve and promulgate the faith delivered to the holy Apostles and disciples of Christ. From the history of Ephesus we derive some special and important information concerning the law of the priesthood which the Apostles established when they provided for the change from apostolic to episcopal government throughout the great missionary field of their labors.

At Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome and Alexandria, fixed episcopal Sees were established, and the local clergy of presbyters and deacons were organized under their bishops. This is quite sufficient to prove that Christ and the Apostles framed the ecclesiastical polity on the episcopal model. That this was the one universal, unchangeable order is evident, when the truly sacerdotal character of the apostolic ministry is considered. The sacerdotal character could only be transmitted by ordination at the hands of men specially empowered as were the Apostles. Presbyters did not possess this power, and therefore no church could be complete without a higher ministry, through which it could receive the benefit of apostolic succession.

The apostolic commission was a permanent one. The foundation of the Church was apostolic. An apostolic succession was therefore essential. And, from the beginning, this apostolic succession has been regarded as the inheritance, not of the priesthood at large but of a select number of chief priests, to whom the title of bishop has been assigned as their specific official designation. Whatever may have been the temporary and provisional government of local churches under the general supervision of the Apostles, during the twenty-five years of their missionary labors, it is certain that before the beginning of the last third of the first century they established everywhere the episcopal regimen. St. Jerome, who is often cited, *hors de propos*, as a witness against the *jus divinum* of the episcopate, gives clear testimony on this point.

"The well-being of the Church depends on the dignity of the Chief Priest, and unless there exists a certain unparticipated and exalted power there will be as many schisms as there are priests in the Church."²

"If we inquire why in the Church a baptized person does not

¹ 1 Cor., iv., 1.

² *Adv. Lucif.*

receive the Holy Spirit, except through the hands of a bishop, learn that this observance descends from the same authority which teaches that the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles."¹

"With us, bishops hold the place of the Apostles." "All are successors of the Apostles."

In the narrative of the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, in the Acts, it is recorded that before their return to Antioch "they ordained priests (presbyters) for them in every church."²

St. Jerome asserts that during this period and down to very near the close of the following extensive missions of St. Paul, in the neighborhood of A.D. 60, the churches were left under the charge of these presbyters, the Apostles, of course, as the history relates, exercising a general supervision over them. But, on account of dissensions, especially at Corinth, St. Jerome goes on to say, "that it was decreed in the whole world (implying that this was done by an apostolic council) that one chosen from the presbyters should be placed over the others, to whom the whole care of the Church should belong, and the seeds of schisms be thus taken away."⁴

St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus between the years 56 and 59, in which he rebukes them for their divisions. If the statement of St. Jerome was anything more than a conjecture and had any foundation in fact, it would appear that it was about this time that St. Paul and the other Apostles took special and active measures for giving the Asiatic churches they had gathered a more regular and permanent constitution.

St. Paul's two Epistles to Timothy prove that he appointed and ordained him bishop of that city, as the local and general tradition testifies, and the similar Epistle to Titus equally shows that episcopal supervision over Crete was assigned to him. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus are an apostolic legacy of advice and instruction, not only to these two bishops, but to all others holding the same office, which the original Apostles, as they were about to disappear from the scene of their labors, were handing over to their successors. Regarded in this light, as admonitory encyclicals addressed to bishops who not only governed particular churches but were also pre-eminent among their brethren and the forerunners of canonically instituted metropolitans, these letters are full of interest and significance. Otherwise they are not intelligible, and therefore rationalistic critics have shown a great desire to get rid of them.

The consecration of Timothy to the episcopate of Ephesus was evidently an event of a momentous character, directed by a special divine revelation, like the mission of Paul and Barnabas from An-

¹ *Ibid.*² *Ad. Evang.*³ xiv., 22.⁴ *Comm. Titus.*

tioch. Several other men of apostolic dignity took part with St. Paul in the solemn act. "I admonish thee," he writes to him, "to stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the laying on of my hands."¹ And again: "Neglect not the grace which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with imposition of hands of the priesthood (presbytery)."²

In another place he writes: "This charge I give to thee, child Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before concerning thee, that in them thou mayest war a good warfare."³

It need not surprise us that St. Paul and his assistants in the ordination of Timothy are called a "presbytery," and this is not in the slightest degree a proof that mere presbyters could ever ordain. St. Chrysostom (*in loc.*) says: "He speaks here not of priests, but of bishops, for the priests did not ordain a bishop." The title of presbyter is used by the sacred writers of the New Testament, and by later ecclesiastical writers, as a generic term, including all grades of the ministry above the order of deacons, even popes and apostles. In its specific sense it was the title of priests of the second order. In the same manner, the Latin term, *sacerdos*, and all the modern derivatives of *presbyter*, such as the English word priest, have been habitually and continuously applied to bishops, who are priests *par excellence*.

St. Jerome and St. John Chrysostom say also that the title of bishop is given in the New Testament to presbyters engaged in pastoral duties.

Anti-Catholic writers are continually insisting on the lack of clearly marked distinction between bishops and presbyters in the New Testament as an argument against the divine constitution of the episcopate. The contention is of no force, however, against the positive and conclusive evidence that the Apostles established the priesthood as a bi-partite order, giving the fulness of the sacerdotal character to their true and proper successors, and a limited participation in the same to priests of the second class, *i.e.*, simple presbyters.

It is certain that from the time when local chief pastors were appointed to rule the churches everywhere, their only proper title was bishop.

It appertained to them exclusively so soon as the ecclesiastical nomenclature became fixed and settled, with the single exception of the later *chor-episcopi*, many of whom were presbyters, having a decanal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over country parishes.

Allowing that, in the beginning, those presbyters who shared in the pastoral office may have been included with the bishops under

¹ II. Ep., ii., 1-6.

² I. Ep., iv., 14.

³ I. Ep., i., 18.

the same title taken in its general sense, meaning overseer; this is a circumstance of no importance. At Athens there was a magistrate called the archon, having assistants called archons. There are four grades of generals and three of admirals in the military service, and in the United States Navy there are four grades of officers, viz., captains, commanders, lieutenant-commanders, and captains of marines, all of whom in common parlance are called captains. If the bishop of a church had presbyters who were his assistants in his sacred office, they might have well been called, in a general way and in a lesser sense, bishops, while the technical designations of ranks in the hierarchy were still in the process of becoming fixed by usage. For instance, in St. Paul's epistle to the Philippians, whose bishop was probably Epiphrodatus, he begins as follows: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." St. Chrysostom comments upon this passage: "What does this mean? Were there, at that time, many bishops in one city? By no means; but he styled the priests by this name; for, up to that time, they used the name promiscuously, and the bishop was even styled deacon," in the general sense of ministry.¹ Other passages, where bishops and presbyters are mentioned, can be explained in the same way, *i.e.*, that in respect to dignity all who have the priestly character are called presbyters, and in respect to office, all who have some pastoral charge are called bishops. It is not, however, necessary to adopt this explanation; for it is not certain that presbyters were ever called bishops, even in the earliest period of the local clergy. The bishops saluted by St. Paul, in his epistle to the Philippians, may have been bishops of neighboring churches. Many of the epistles have the character of encyclicals, intended not merely for the faithful of particular churches but for a wider circle. If there were bishops in the proper sense, either permanently or temporarily within reach of an epistle sent to Philippi, the salutation of Paul and Timothy was primarily addressed to them, and, inclusively, to all presbyters associated with them in their ministry; or, we may understand by the deacons, in a general sense, all ministers inferior to bishops, including presbyters. A precise adherence to technical and formal style is not to be looked for and is not found in the apostolic writings. Nor was it necessary, where all was understood and familiar to the persons addressed; where the spirit of fraternity, charity, and humility placed all Christians, from the prince of the apostles to the humblest of the brethren, upon one common level in the essential relation toward God as His children, toward Jesus Christ as His brethren.

¹ Chrys., *in loc.*

St. Luke relates the history of a most interesting and pathetic scene which was witnessed at Miletus, when St. Paul bade farewell to the clergy of Ephesus and the adjacent region :

"And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Ancients of the Church." They came, St. Irenæus testifies,¹ and St. Paul implies ("all ye, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God") from the various churches of Asia. Some were undoubtedly bishops, others presbyters, and perhaps the chief men of the laity accompanied their clergy. The charges of St. Paul are primarily addressed to the bishops, although it is all appropriate to presbyters as well, and most of it to all who were present, without exception. He exhorts the bishops particularly, in these words: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Spirit has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood."

This passage is a most momentous and emphatic expression of the Catholic doctrine that the episcopate, not to the exclusion, but implying the inclusion, of the subordinate priesthood, is of divine institution, and the foundation on which the Church is built; consequently, a continuation of the apostolate. The language of St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian is the echo of the language of St. Paul.

Among all those bishops, Timothy was pre-eminent. He was the Bishop of Ephesus, the capital of Ionia and the chief city of Proconsular Asia. His see was the chief one, and became, by a natural process of ecclesiastical development, not only a metropolis but an exarchate. St. Timothy governed it until nearly the close of the century, and either to him or to his successor was addressed the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, which St. John was inspired to write in the Apocalypse in the name of the Holy Spirit, who had specially designated and placed St. Timothy as the first bishop of that great See.

In St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy are delineated all the powers, the duties, the principles and rules of action, possessed and carried out by one who was a model for all bishops in all succeeding times.

There is the power of ordaining: "The things which thou hast heard of from me through many witnesses the same commit to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also."² The specific directions given by the apostle relate only to bishops and deacons. Priests are passed over, according to the comment of St. Chrysostom, because the qualifications of a presbyter are not different from those of a bishop. In the Epistle to Titus the apostle expressly

¹ Adv. Haer., l. iii., 14.

² Acts, xx., 17-38.

³ II., ii., 2.

says: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and establish priests (presbyters) in every city." After mentioning certain moral qualities indispensable in a candidate for the priesthood, he proceeds: "For a bishop should be free from censure, as a steward of God."¹ St. John Chrysostom (*in loc.*), considers that the Apostle was directing Titus principally about the ordination of bishops in the cities of Crete. He was acting with apostolic authority and in a missionary capacity, founding churches, and establishing a local clergy, while he probably took charge in person of the Church in the chief city of the island, "exercising a general superintendence such as metropolitans exercise over their suffragans."

The Church in Asia Minor was in a much more advanced and well-ordered condition than it was in Crete. Nevertheless, as the occasion would sometimes arise for filling vacant sees, the pre-eminent rank of the Church of Ephesus and of St. Timothy as its bishop, would naturally give him a great influence in appointing new bishops and the office of consecrating them. Besides, the work of evangelizing those regions and founding new churches was still going on. The instructions of St. Paul in respect to the ordination of bishops are therefore properly to be referred to the case of these chief pastors of churches outside of the city of Ephesus.

Those which relate to presbyters, deacons, and all the different classes of the faithful, are more specially applicable to the government of his own diocese. In general terms he admonishes him to be very careful in his ordinations. "Lay hands quickly on no man, nor be partaker of other men's sins." Speaking of deacons, he directs: "Let these also be first proved (*i.e.*, exercised for a while in lesser offices, and diligently examined—Kenrick), and so let them minister, being charged with no crime. For those who minister well, gain for themselves a good degree (promotion to a higher order—Kenrick)."

"Let priests (presbyters) who rule well be esteemed worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in word and doctrine. Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, unless with two or three witnesses. Those who sin rebuke before all, that the others also may fear."²

In his first Epistle St. Paul tells Timothy: "These things I write to thee, hoping to come to thee shortly, But if I tarry long, that thou mayst know how thou oughtest to act in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, pillar and ground of the truth."³ Evidently, St. Paul has confided to Timothy his

¹ i., 5-7.² Kenrick *in loc.*³ I., iii., iv., v.⁴ iii., 15.

own apostolic office, leaving him to replace himself in that supervision and supreme jurisdiction which he had been exercising in person during his missionary career. The presentiment of the approaching end of this career betrays itself. In point of fact, his tarrying had no end, for he never returned, and thus Timothy was left by his master with only the legacy of his example and his instructions to guide him in the exercise of the episcopal office.

In his second Epistle, which may have been the last he ever wrote which has been preserved, this presentiment is more definite. The Apostle, being near his term, breaks out into his triumphant death-song: "For I am now to be sacrificed, and the time of my dissolution is at hand. I have fought the good fight. I have finished the course. I have kept the faith. As to the rest, a crown of justice is laid up for me, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me on that day."¹

With St. Paul, St. Peter and the other surviving Apostles soon finished their earthly career. Jerusalem, particularly its most sacred portion, the Temple, was destroyed, and from A. D. 70 until A. D. 100, St. John alone of the apostolic college was left as the last link of the chain connecting the apostolate with the episcopate, the first with the second century of Christianity. St. John lived mostly at Ephesus, "founded and ruled all the churches of Asia," as St. Jerome affirms, completed the Canon of Scripture, and wrote his sublime Apocalypse, his beautiful and precious Gospel. The place of St. Paul was therefore filled by St. John, and his work continued. He did not, however, supersede the bishops, for he addresses them in the Apocalypse as having all the charges and responsibilities of the pastoral office. The hierarchy was universally and permanently constituted before St. Peter and his colleagues sprinkled the foundations of the Church with their blood.

During the last forty years of the first century the work of evangelization must have been prosecuted with immense enthusiasm, energy and success. This is the period of historic blank, of which anti-Catholic writers complain so much, because it gives them no record of their fancied transformation of Christianity, a process which they have determined must have germinated during this interval. They will never find in this dark cave the seven sleepers who will awake and tell of a primitive Christianity without hierarchy, changing gradually and imperceptibly into a hierarchical Catholicism. It is proved that the hierarchical organization had been constituted when St. Peter and St. Paul suffered

¹ iv., 6-8.

martyrdom. St John survived to give his sanction and blessing to all the work of the successors of the Apostles during the last half of the last third of the first century. In the second century we find the Eastern and Western divisions of the Roman Empire and some outlying regions dotted all over with episcopal sees, and these single churches confederated in provinces, exarchates and patriarchates, under the Supreme Primacy of the Roman Church, although not under the stately forms and systematic laws which grew up during the two succeeding centuries. What is the reasonable conclusion? That there was a regular, normal progress from St. Peter to St. Victor, St. Mark to St. Dionysius, St. Timothy to Polycrates, St. James the Less to St. Cyril, St. John to St. Irenaeus, in the same lines, from the same principles, and proceeding from a divine origin.

That the Catholic Idea of the Church is the one presented in the New Testament is sufficiently proved by the one foregoing line of argument, showing that the Church is a society organized on the hierarchical principle. It is one great Sacrament, *i.e.*, an outward and visible Body, with an indwelling Spirit, containing and imparting grace, as the instrument of the Author and Giver of grace.

It is proper, however, to proceed still further, by proving that the New Testament teaches the Catholic doctrine respecting the special sacraments of the gospel. That baptism is the sacrament of regeneration is a distinctly Catholic doctrine and pre-supposes the Catholic Idea of the Church. It is true that Luther patched this doctrine together with the real presence, into his crazy-quilt; but it is incompatible with the pseudo-evangelical scheme of Christianity.

Those Protestants who really hold it have taken a long step backward toward Catholicism. The evidence from the New Testament that men are spiritually regenerated in the sacrament of baptism is abundant. The Lord said to Nicodemus: "Unless one be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."¹

St. Peter, in his Pentecostal sermon, exhorted his hearers: "Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."² Ananias said to Saul of Tarsus: "Rise up, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."³

St. Paul writes to the Colossians: "In whom also ye are circumcised, with a circumcision not made with the hand, in the stripping off of the body of the flesh, but with the circumcision of

¹ St. John, iii., 5.² Acts, ii., 38.³ Acts, xxii., 16.

Christ: Buried with him in baptism, in whom also ye are risen again by the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."¹

To Titus: "According to His mercy He saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, . . . that being justified by His grace, we may be heirs according to hope of eternal life."²

The analogy of faith requires that there should be other sacraments signifying and conferring grace. And the other six are mentioned in the New Testament. The Holy Eucharist is not disputed, and Order has been already proved. Confirmation is connected with baptism as one of the first elements of the Christian religion, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "Wherefore omitting to speak of our commencement in Christ let us proceed to more perfect things, not laying again a foundation of penance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms (*i.e.*, Jewish ablutions, John's baptism, and Christian baptism as distinguished from these), and of the laying on of hands (when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit, he says, came upon them)³ and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."⁴

The Sacrament of Penance. "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins ye shall retain they are retained."⁵

Extreme Unction. "Is any man sick among you? Let him call in the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."⁶

Matrimony. "This mystery is great, but I say in Christ and in the Church."⁷

The ministers of Christ in the apostolic order and succession are the "stewards of the mysteries," commissioned not by the people but by God; the guardians and administrators of the sacraments and of the grace contained in them. Through communion with them, their lawful pastors, the faithful are united in one Church, in faith, discipline, and the supernatural life of Christ.

This mediatorial office of the ministers of Christ constitutes their generic character of priesthood, and is the foundation of all its specific attributes. In the more strict and proper sense, the specific essence of priesthood is in a divine commission to offer sacrifice.

Among all the seven sacraments the chief and most excellent is the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, which is also the one Sacrifice of the New Law. In this sacrament, Jesus Christ makes His body and blood really and substantially present under the species

¹ II. ii., 11, 12.

² iii., 5-7.

³ *St. Chrys. in loc.*

⁴ vi., 1, 2.

⁵ St. John, xx., 23.

⁶ Ep. St. James, v., 14.

⁷ Eph., v., 32.

of bread and wine, as a sacrifice of adoration, thanksgiving, expiation, and impetration, in which all the merits of the Sacrifice of the Cross are offered up to God and applied to men.

In the communion, it is also the spiritual sustenance of Christians, the source of grace and life, the very bread of angels, and the earnest of immortality. The highest act of the Christian priesthood is therefore the consecration of the Holy Eucharist. No man is capable of performing this act without a special communication of the sacerdotal character of Jesus Christ. And herein lies the special necessity of the Sacrament of Order, and of the positive law of Jesus Christ, confiding the power of ordination to the Apostles and their successors. It is also true of all the other sacraments except baptism and matrimony that their validity depends upon the ordination of the minister. No ordination of priests has ever been recognized as valid in the Church except ordination by a bishop, himself empowered by a special consecration received through an unbroken series of bishops from the Apostles and Jesus Christ. Hence the absolute necessity of the apostolic succession in the episcopate, not merely to the well-being and good order of the Church, but to its very being. The Church subsists chiefly in the priesthood, and the priesthood in the bishops, who have received the plenitude of the priesthood, and who are themselves bound together in one under their supreme head, the Bishop of the Catholic Church.

The priesthood is especially correlated to sacrifice, and the Catholic doctrine of the sacrificial nature of the sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist is principally derived from the dogma of the Real Presence. It is superfluous to cite the passages from the New Testament in which this dogma is declared. There is no dogma of faith more clearly and explicitly revealed than this one, in the Written Word of God. And the numerous works of able and learned authors fully treating of the doctrine are so easily accessible that there is no occasion for giving in this article even the briefest epitome of their arguments.

There are, however, some more general considerations in respect to the Catholic doctrine of priesthood and sacrifice in the New Law of the Christian Church which we will briefly present. The foundation of the whole doctrine lies in the dogma of faith, that Jesus Christ, true God and true man, the Mediator of the New Covenant, is a Priest *forever*, after the order of Melchisedech. For this reason, He must, besides fulfilling all the other functions of a Mediator, continually offer a sacrifice like that of Melchisedech, viz., a *Minchah*, the elements of which are Bread and Wine. To this end, He must have human priests who represent His person on the earth. In the epistle to the Hebrews the faithful are

exhorted to "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Jesus."¹ Those two titles are connected as correlated terms, expressing the Mission of the Son in His human nature from the Father. St. Peter and his twelve colleagues in the apostleship received a communication of this same mission. Whatever Jesus Christ was by virtue of this mission, they were, in a lesser and subordinate sense, as vicars and representatives of Christ, representing God before the people, and the people before God. That is they were mediators, through whom Christ exercised His mediatorial office. As Mediator He is Prophet, Priest and King; and so they also, must have a delegated prophetic, priestly and ruling office in the Church. Their commission was given to them as perpetual, lasting until the end of the world. And therefore, although certain additional and temporary gifts were granted to the original Apostles and to many other individuals among the primitive clergy and laity, the essential endowments of the priesthood, as well as the essential Christian graces, were made transmissible along the line of apostolic succession. All this is explicitly and abundantly taught, in the New Testament, as Catholic writers, and to a certain extent Protestant writers of the highest reputation, have very fully and unanswerably proved.

There is, therefore, a perpetual priesthood in the Catholic Church, for offering sacrifice, administering sacraments, preaching the word of God, and governing the Christian society.

It is often objected that the terms of sacerdotal and liturgical usage in the Greek language were not adopted by the apostolic writers of the books of the New Testament, to designate offices and ordinances in the Christian Church. Certainly, there is much in the silence, the obscurity, the omissions, and in general the negative characteristics of the New Testament which surprises us; and would not only surprise but bewilder us if we regarded the Bible as the only and the proximate rule of faith. The difference in phraseology between the sacred writings of the New Testament and the writings of St. Cyprian, for instance, is very marked; and we can perceive a gradual change in ecclesiastical style during the two centuries between him and St. Paul.

A prejudice and objection against the Catholic doctrine from this source arises only from a superficial view of the text of the New Testament, and of the earliest Christian writers. It disappears upon a closer examination.

There was a reason why the Lord should cover the mysteries contained in His person and His work with a veil which was only partially and gradually lifted during the earliest period of the

¹ iii., 1.

manifestation of the truth and grace of the Gospel to the world. The clear manifestation of the high-priesthood of Jesus Christ, involving the abrogation of the Aaronic priesthood, was not made in the earliest writings of the New Testament. It appears first with great distinctness in the Epistle to the Hebrews, at a time when Judaism was approaching its last agony and the destruction of Jerusalem was near at hand. Even in this epistle, it is the priesthood of Jesus Christ as anointed to fulfil the work of redemption by the bloody sacrifice of the Cross, the one and only oblation of its kind, once offered, which is alone the topic of a clear and full exposition. The topic of the continual, unbloody sacrifice of the New Law, and the priesthood in the Christian Church, is not treated, but is left covered by the veil which shrouded the Christian mysteries from the profane and the uninitiated. That economy and principle of reserve in communicating religious knowledge which the Lord practised during his personal ministry, was continued by the apostles. The discipline of the secret was observed even down to the time of Tertullian, Origen and St. Cyprian. It was specially enforced in respect to the rites and ceremonies of the Holy Eucharist. Besides all the reasons which persuaded the apostles to establish and observe this discipline in general, there were particular motives for hiding their claims to sacerdotal and pontifical prerogatives under modest and unassuming titles. If St. James had openly proclaimed that the Temple with its hierarchy, its sacrifices, its Paschal and Pentecostal feasts had been set aside in favor of a New Law; that the Cœnaculum was the true temple, where the Lamb of God was mystically offered on a Christian altar by Himself as the real High Priest in Jerusalem of a new Covenant, He could not have remained one day in Jerusalem. If St. Peter and the Apostles had assumed high-sounding titles like those of Jewish and Pagan pontiffs, and bidden open defiance to the chiefs of the national religions, the fury of persecution would have been sooner and more violently enkindled, and only an immediate and irresistible exercise of omnipotence could have prevented the strangling of the infant Church in its cradle.

As the hidden significance and power of Christianity by degrees revealed itself, the imperial monster began to fear it, and a Decius could say that he dreaded the succession of a new Bishop of Rome more than the appearance of a rival claimant to the throne. Christianity came upon the arena in due course of events to contend for the dominion of the world. And when, by degrees, its doctrines and institutions became more publicly known, Christian writers naturally fell into the use of those Greek and Latin terms which were consecrated by long custom to express elements common to all religions.

There are not wanting, however, hints, allusions, and occasional expressions in the sacred writings which are like rifts in the veil which the discipline of the secret hung over the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion, its sacerdotal functions and holy rites of worship. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jesus Christ is declared to be, not only a Priest, inasmuch as he offered an atoning sacrifice on the cross, but also "a great Priest over the house of God,"¹ i.e. the Church. St. Paul calls Christian believers "a chosen race, a royal priesthood,"² and similar language is used in the Apocalypse. The sacerdotal character of Christ's headship over the Church, imparting a share of His fulness of grace to His members, implies a priesthood *par excellence*, in the principal and ruling members of the body of Christ. St. Paul to the Romans speaks of "the grace which is given me of God, that I should be the minister of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles: ministering the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable, and sanctified in the Holy Spirit."³ The significance of this passage is diminished and obscured in the Latin, still more in the English version. The Greek word rendered by "minister" is *λειτουργος*, minister of sacred rites, the word rendered by "sanctificans," and "ministering" is *ιερουργεῖν*, enacting as a priest that which the Gospel contains: and the word translated by "oblation" is the purely sacrificial term *προσφορά*.

The direct scope and intent of this passage, no doubt, refers to the conversion of the Gentiles, and the fruits of virtue and piety produced among them are described in metaphorical language borrowed from sacrificial rites. Yet the whole phraseology is sacerdotal and allusive to the Christian Sacrifice and sacraments. Catechumens would not understand more than met the ear. But the initiated would understand what was given in baptism, confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. They would think of the continual approach to the altar to assist at the mysteries and receive communion, by which all their prayers and good works were hallowed and made sacrificial offerings to God through Christ.

When the Hebrew Christians were exhorted: "Having, therefore, brethren, confidence to enter into the sanctuary by the blood of Christ, by the new and living sacrifice way which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is, His own flesh, and having a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in the fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with clean water,"⁴ they understood this in accordance with the teaching they had already received.

¹ x., 21.² Eph. I. Ep., ii., 9.³ xv., 15, 16.⁴ x., 19-22.

We know the Roman tradition derived from St. Peter and St. Paul, and by it we can interpret the hidden meaning of St. Paul, which was perfectly intelligible to the faithful of Rome when his Epistle was read to them or perused devoutly in their private copies. We know the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem by the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril. And we can surely infer that those who read the Epistle to the Hebrews understood by the washing in pure water the sacrament of baptism, and that the way of drawing near to Christ was by the sacrament of the altar.

They must have understood the altar of the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice to be meant in the words of their inspired teacher: "We have an altar (*θυσιαστήριον*, *i.e.*, sacrificatorium) whereof they who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat"; and that the exhortation: "Through Him, therefore, let us offer always a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips celebrating His name," was most perfectly fulfilled by joining in the hymns and prayers of their liturgical worship.¹

The Liturgy is alluded to in the description of an event which took place at Antioch when Paul and Barnabas were sent forth on their great apostolical mission. The Church of Antioch at this early period presented a most interesting spectacle.

St. Peter had previously taken a special and personal oversight of the blooming and flourishing congregation, in which the glorious name of "Christian" first began to be applied to the disciples of Christ; so that the ancient tradition designated him as its first bishop, and the patriarchal dignity which was acquired by Antioch took its first principal motive from its quality as a See of Peter. At the time described by St. Luke, when he begins his history of the long and extensive missionary career of St. Paul, a considerable group of the higher clergy were gathered together in the principal church of the city. The same historian calls them "prophets and teachers."

They were therefore endowed with the extraordinary charismata which were at that time so frequently and abundantly given to the men who were employed in laying the foundations of Christianity. Among those was the gift of prophecy, supernatural illumination in respect to the doctrines of the faith, in respect to the measures to be undertaken in propagating the faith, and, where necessary, foresight of future events.

They were also specially engaged in preaching the Word, for the instruction of the faithful, of catechumens, and of the hearers from among Jews and heathens, who came to get information about

¹ Heb., xiii., 10, 15.

the new religion. It appears that a continual round of exercises of preaching, prayer, religious observances and devotions, accompanied by frequent and strict fasting, was kept up in the church with unusual zeal and fervor.

"Now there were in the church, which was at Antioch, prophets and teachers, among them Barnabas, and Simon who was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen, who was the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Spirit said to them: 'Set apart for Me Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have called them.' And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."¹

Whether this solemn setting apart of Saul and Barnabas was their episcopal consecration, as St. John Chrysostom and many commentators down to Kenrick suppose, or an extraordinary invocation of the Holy Spirit and benediction in His name given by inspiration at the inauguration of the great work of the conversion of the Gentiles, we shall not stop to consider. The special reason we have for citing this passage is found in the phrase "ministering to the Lord."

The Greek word is *leitourgeountes*, which Erasmus translates *sacificantibus*. It is literally translated, *performing liturgical acts*. They were ministering to the Lord, and not merely to the people, performing acts of worship for which they prepared themselves by fasting. The acts of this ministration were a liturgy, *i.e.*, according to the only Christian sense from the beginning until now, a solemn celebration of the Holy Eucharist. St. Luke's readers who belonged to the faithful would know by this single word what was done in the church of Antioch, and have a picture before their mind of the sanctuary, the clergy, the rites, and prayers. If we would get their view, we must look back on the scene through the glass of tradition. St. John Chrysostom, in the fifth century, compiled a Liturgy which has been ever since generally used in churches of the Greek Rite. This Liturgy was a recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil of Cæsarea, which was derived from the Liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem. This Liturgy of St. James, also those of St. Peter, St. John and St. Mark, are undoubtedly of apostolic origin, and all agree with each other and with all Catholic liturgies in essentials and in some accidentals, while exhibiting many variations in other minor respects. These liturgies, it is needless to say, explicitly and fully express the doctrines of the real presence and of the sacrificial nature of the Holy Eucharist. From them we know the doctrine and the liturgical practice of the apostolic age.

¹ Acts, xiii., 1-3.

If space permitted, a thorough analysis and exposition of the Epistle of Pope Clement, the First to the Corinthians, written about A.D. 97, would give a complete justification of the thesis of this article. He was a disciple of the Apostles, and lived through the pontificates of the two immediate successors of St. Peter, St. Linus and St. Anacletus, the period which may justly be called the historical blank. The effort to extend this period as far as the year 120 is not well sustained. The most probable date of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius and of his Epistles is the year 107 or thereabouts. From St. Clement and St. Ignatius, survivors of the Apostles and contemporaries with St. John, perfectly familiar therefore with the constitution of the Church and hierarchy during the last thirty years of the first century, we have all the testimony we need to connect the teaching and action of St. Paul with those of St. Polycarp, St. Irenæus and Tertullian. It is impossible to insert a wedge anywhere along the line to break the continuity of the apostolic tradition. The statements of St. Irenæus respecting the apostolic origin and authority of the Catholic episcopate of the second century must be taken as absolutely true and irrefragable.

There is one essential element in the Catholic Idea remaining to be spoken of, viz., the infallible authority of the *Ecclesia Docens*. The doctrine that the teaching of the Church is the proximate rule of faith, having for its object the revealed word of God, both written and unwritten, and its sources in Scripture and Apostolic tradition, is so indissolubly interwoven with the fact and dogma of apostolic succession in the Episcopate that it really does not need, though it is abundantly capable of, separate proof from the New Testament.

The Catholic Idea is that the Church is the one institute of salvation. The individual believer receives his life in and through the Church. The radical principle of this life, of justification and sanctification, is faith. Faith must therefore be received from the Holy Spirit through the Church. The faith is one and is the inmost principle,—the vital force of Catholic unity. This unity being primarily instituted in the unity of the hierarchy, the faith of the body of bishops, under their supreme head, that is of the *Ecclesia Docens*, is the rule of the faith of the body of Christian believers.

That the apostles were the *Ecclesia Docens*, that they were infallible in their doctrinal and moral teaching, and that this teaching was the rule of faith to the Church, is unquestionable. This rule must be in some way permanent. The common Protestant doctrine is well known, that, viz., the apostolic teaching was embodied in the books of the New Testament, which, together with the

books contained in the Jewish Canon of Holy Scripture, became the proximate, permanent and only rule of faith for all Christian believers to the end of time. It is one of the surprising phenomena of history that such a doctrine has found a wide acceptance. It is incredible, on the face of it, that the apostles left such a rule of faith to the Church of future ages. But, supposing that this had been their intention and the will of God, it is plain that they must have given a canon of the Scriptures of both Testaments: *i.e.*, St. John must have done so, or at least have added his own writings to the catalogue of canonical books. Besides, considering what the Bible actually is, and how impossible it would be for all the faithful to take their faith at first hand from the whole miscellaneous collection of inspired writings, it would seem that an inspired compendium of its divine doctrines and precepts must have been published, with a strict command that it should be read by all who could read, and taught orally to all others, as a condition of church-fellowship.

In point of fact there is not the slightest indication either in the New Testament or in the early ecclesiastical writers of any change of the rule of faith from a living, teaching authority to a collection of inspired writings. The commission of teaching given to the Apostles, like the commission of government and administration of sacraments, is given without any limitation of time and place, as perpetual and universal. It is, therefore, a commission to themselves and their successors forever.

The First Epistle of St. John, which was probably addressed about the year 92 to the bishops of Asia Minor as an introduction to his gospel, gives the final apostolic declaration concerning the rule of faith.

"We are of God. He who knoweth God heareth us; he who is not of God heareth us not; in this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."¹ St. John was the only Apostle living at this time. The only authoritative teachers whom he could have meant to associate with himself were the bishops whom he was addressing and other Catholic bishops.

Thirty years before this time, St. Paul addresses St. Timothy, the chief among these same bishops of Asia Minor, as one to whom the apostolic commission of teaching had been imparted. The rule which he is to follow is the apostolic teaching which he received from St. Paul, and which he is to commit to all those whom he ordains to the episcopal office. "O Timothy, keep the deposit. Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me. And the things which thou hast heard from me through many

¹ 1 Ep., iv., 6.

witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also."¹

In connection with these and other passages presenting the doctrine of the living teacher as the proximate rule of Catholic faith, and the tradition of the unwritten word as one part of the remote rule, there is a most interesting and important text concerning Holy Scripture as another part of the same rule.

"Continue then in the things which thou hast learned and which are committed to thee, knowing from whom thou hast learned them. And because from infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every Scripture divinely inspired is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in justice."²

This is one of the few passages in the apostolic writings in which the inspiration of Holy Scripture is clearly and explicitly declared. We may infer that St. Paul included New Testament Scriptures with those of the Old Testament as divinely inspired, since St. Peter classes the epistles of St. Paul with the other Scriptures. But for a positive, categorical declaration of this doctrine we depend on tradition and the decision of the Church, as well as for the complete and certain canon of the books of both Testaments. That inspiration ceased, and the divine revelation was finally completed when the last Apostle died, we know only by the teaching of the Church. In this way only we know, therefore, what gifts of the Spirit were personal to the Apostles, and what was the limitation of the apostolic office and commission which they transmitted to their successors. The Apostles alone were founders of the Church, because it could be founded only once. Their institution of sacraments, their constitution of the hierarchy, their promulgation of the faith, their deliverance of revealed and inspired truths orally and in writing, were accomplished once for all as a permanent and unchangeable work. But as they must necessarily have successors in government, administration of sacraments, preaching of the gospel to all mankind, so the duty and the power of preserving, interpreting and teaching the divine dogmas and precepts of the Christian Revelation must have been handed down to these successors. Infallibility is necessarily implied in the existence of this duty and power of the *Ecclesia Docens*, i.e., the Catholic Episcopate.³

It is an essential part of the Catholic idea that the supreme apostolate was given to St. Peter and the supreme episcopate to

¹ II., iii., 14-16.

² I Ep., vi., 20; II., i.; 13, ii., 2.

³ See F. Lyons' *Christianity and Infallibility*, ch. iii. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 15 E. 16th Street.

his successors in the Roman See, which is, in a supereminent sense, the Holy and Apostolic See of the Catholic Church.

The first time that the Catholic Church is spoken of in the Gospel is on the memorable occasion when the Lord exacted from St. Peter at Cæsarea-Philippi the confession of His divinity.

"Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And Jesus answered and said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father, who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."¹ Comment upon this passage is quite unnecessary and seems only to detract from its force. An intelligent child who knows in a general way the history and the claims of the Roman See can perceive that it can possibly have but one meaning. It is quite enough by itself, without citing the other passages of the same import from the New Testament. It sums up the whole Catholic doctrine of the Church.

The Catholic idea in the New Testament has been presented only by marking some salient points and indicating the lines of an argument which is capable of a much fuller and more complete development. Notwithstanding the great ability and excellence, the learning and conclusive reasoning, of many Catholic works proving all the doctrine of the Church from the Scriptures, this rich mine is by no means exhausted. It is possible and most desirable that new and skilful workmen should bring forth the treasures hidden in these divine Scriptures, and by the aid of all the resources of modern scholarship, illustrate in new methods, adapted to modern wants and conditions, the truths of revelation ever ancient and ever new.

The same may be said of early ecclesiastical history. After all the works of research and historical criticism which have thrown light upon this comparatively obscure period, there still remains a great work to be done in this department. I do not say that this work needs to be begun. Already excellent treatises have appeared in Italy, France and Germany, and their number has constantly increased. Some of these have been translated into English. But our English Catholic literature needs to be enriched, and we need especially to have all that the best scholarship can furnish, both from Scripture and ancient authors, bearing on the

¹ St. Matt., xvi., 16-19.

exposition of all the principal Catholic doctrines, collected, arranged and put in convenient shape for general use, in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

Thorough work, not only in the earliest, but also in the later ecclesiastical history, has been already commenced at the Catholic University. In the present article, and the one preceding, which contain the substance of lectures given during the University Public Course, we have, of course, not pretended to treat our topics exhaustively. To do so would require one or more volumes. But we are confident that we have sufficiently proved that Scriptural and Historical Christianity are identical with each other, and each is identical with Catholicism. These three terms are indissolubly united. The effort to break the historical continuity of Catholicism by finding a foothold in the earliest period of Christianity for that system of pseudo-spiritualism which, for want of a better name, we will call Evangelicalism, has proved an utter failure. In like manner, the endeavor to establish the same on the foundation of Holy Scripture as a so-called Bible-Christianity, has turned out to be futile.

There cannot be a dogmatic Christianity without a tradition correlated to the Holy Scripture, and a doctrinal authority in the Church. The old Protestant orthodoxy has ceased to put forth the appearance of a systematic theology, presenting a strong front and array for defence or aggression.

It is true, that it still counts able and scholarly men, who produce works which are full of learning, and not wanting in sound reasoning and valuable instruction in relation to many matters of natural and revealed religion. But, to a great extent, the best of these works are written in defence of facts, principles, truths, and ideas, which are substantially Catholic.

When it comes to a systematic and definite exposition and defence of the proper differential Protestant theory of religion, as opposite to the Catholic idea, we find little except silence, evasion, ignoring of Catholic arguments, and a petty criticism which picks flaws in exegesis or evidence, and tries to hide in all the obscure caves it can find. Indeed, by common consent, the day of the old Protestant orthodoxy is over. Its dogmatism is melting away into sentimentalism. Just as the old Eastern empire was invaded and vanquished by the Saracens, its ecclesiastical domain is melting away before the incursion of rationalism. The Bible, which Chillingworth called "The Religion of Protestants," is being torn in pieces by its former worshippers. Devout believers in the divinity of Christ and the inspiration of the Bible have really no refuge to flee into but the old Catholic Church, from which they are estranged through the crime of the original schismatics of the

sixteenth century. For three hundred years they have been feeding on the crumbs falling from the table of the children of the household of God. The successors of these destroyers of faith are striving now to drive them out from even the courtyard of the Church into the streets. They are welcome to the banqueting-hall, and to the well-provided table of the children, where the bread of angels is blessed and distributed by the priests of the Lord.

There is no refuge in rationalism. It is not better, but rather worse, than old Protestantism, because it is more logical and consistent. The better the logic, the worse and falser the conclusions, when the premises are bad and false. It is all destructive, and its final end is destruction. It can originate and construct nothing whatever, much less anything better than old, genuine Christianity. Christianity, without the divinity of Christ, is not worth having. Without Christianity, Theism and Natural Religion cannot stand. Believe in God, and you must believe in Christ; believe in Christ, and you must believe in the Church. Reject the Church, and you must reject the true Christ of the Gospel, God and Man, the Redeemer of the World, the Crucified, Risen Lord of Heaven and Earth. Reject the Son, and you must deny the Father, the Creator, the Giver of Immortality. The quicksands of agnosticism, universal skepticism, pessimism, nihilism, will swallow you up. You can be saved from this dismal catastrophe only by inconsistency. A happy inconsistency, indeed, but still an inconsistency. If you would have a religion which is at once rational, historical, and Scriptural, which is the genuine, authentic religion of Christ, you must embrace the Christianity of the Catholic Church, for there is no other which satisfies the demands of reason and of faith.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

THE CHURCH AND ENGLISH LIBERTY.

THE erudite Balmes, in his great work on "Civilization," says, that "before Protestantism, European civilization had reached all the development which was possible for it." The gifted Spaniard means, of course, all the development possible under the circumstances; for, so long as human nature continues to be what it is, there will always be room for social improvement.

This much is certain, that long before the appearance of Protestantism, the Church had throttled barbarism and thrown it—had exorcised the spirit of darkness, and enthroned the spirit of light; had caused governments to be established throughout western Europe, in the ages we call dark, that would compare favorably with some of the best of this century of enlightenment; had created representative systems in which the authority of monarchs was limited, and fundamental laws were in full force; had founded schools, universities, and hospitals; in a word, had put forward all the principles of civilization, and embodied the most salutary of them in institutions with wonderful results. When Protestantism came to impede and cripple her, she had placed the liberties of many nations on a secure basis. That she had done so in England, it is the purpose of this article to show.

The mission of the Church, in every country to which her devoted and heroic children have borne her banner, is to proclaim the truth to high and low alike. The ruler and the ruled must learn and practice her doctrines. These doctrines are the same the world over, and while she respects the *bona fide* compacts of men, her teaching, radiant with the spirit caught from the Sermon on the Mount, inculcates more enlightened action. With *de jure*, or even *de facto* governments, whatever there may be in them of an objectionable nature, she does not violently interfere. She satisfies herself with sowing the seed, and awaits, in sighs and tears but with hope, the coming of the harvest. Her mission and method are well expressed by the poet, John Henry Cardinal Newman:

"Bide thou thy time!
Watch with meek eyes the race of pride and crime,
Sit in the gate, and be the heathen's jest,
Smiling and self-possessed.
O, thou, to whom is pledged a victor's sway,
Bide thou the victor's day!

"Think on the sin
That reaped the unripe seed, and toiled to win
Foul history-marks at Bethel and at Dan,
No blessing, but a ban ;
Whilst the wise Shepherd hid his heaven-told fate,
Nor reck'd a tyrant's hate.

"Such loss is gain ;
Wait the bright Advent that shall loose thy chain !
E'en now the shadows break, and gleams divine
Edge the dim distant line
When thrones are trembling and earth's fat ones quail,
True Seed ! thou shalt prevail !"

Such was her course in the days of the Cæsars ; and such has been her course ever since. It has borne abundant fruit in every land, but especially in the land that was destined to play the same part in the modern world as Greece and Rome in the ancient.

The materials which Augustine and his followers found for their work in the land from which Roman civilization had been extirpated were, indeed, disheartening to flesh and blood ; but men with the commission of heaven, the sword of the spirit, and the promises of the law, cared not, recked not. Radiant with hope, buoyed up with love, filled with human and divine knowledge, they entered on their mission with the banner of the Redeemer high in air, and the canticles of Mother Church ascending to heaven. Soon paganism tottered to its fall, the shackles were broken from the limbs of the Briton, attempts were made to restore conformity in the ancient Church, its ministers were reformed, and its children recalled to the land of their nativity and love. Kings and queens received the sceptre of truth, and wielded it with zeal and efficacy. The transformation effected by Augustine and his followers in their day, was truly marvellous considering the forces against which they had to contend—forces against which Pict and Scot and Briton were as chaff before the wind, and Roman and Christian civilization as débris before the hurricane. The oak tree, under whose shadow royalty received the message that Paul had thundered centuries before on Mars Hill, expanded its boughs and branches until all parts of the Saxon Heptarchy found shelter and asylum under it.

This happy consummation was accompanied with many reforms in the government of the country. Though the Roman Empire had yielded to the inroads of Goth and Hun, Visigoth and Ostrogoth—though scourge after scourge had drained its veins and paralyzed its march—though it sat disconsolate, sighing over departed greatness—its laws and literature perpetuated its rule as effectually, in one sense, as its legions had done in the days when they triumphantly bore her eagles through every part of the world. The

weapons were changed, the objects of warfare changed, but the supremacy of the Cæsars was succeeded by the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs. The language and laws of Rome, purified, were borne by saintly men to all quarters of the globe, and the nations that sat in darkness and in the shadow of death, rude and unlettered, received tidings of great joy in a two-fold sense—a redemption in time and in eternity.

Although it was not until the year 1140 that Gratian's splendid work on canon law appeared—although it was not until ninety-four years afterwards that Raimond de Pennafort, commissioned by Gregory IX., published the five books of Decretals—canon law in the days of Augustine was studied as a science, and as a system of jurisprudence compared favorably with the civil code to which it was somewhat indebted.

Now, it was in 596 or 597 that Augustine landed in England, and it was in 529 that Justinian's code appeared. Therefore, the work of Trebonian, the Roman Blackstone, was well known in the early days of Augustine, and must have been freely used by canonists of the period. Previous, however, to the time of Justinian, various collections of the laws had been made, and the Church of those ages, distinguished for the grandest intellects that shone in her history, surrounded by every snare, made herself master of every legitimate art of defence. Situated as she was, she found it necessary to know the law, and that she did know it, whether collected or scattered over almost innumerable volumes, there can be and there is no question.

Lest, however, there may be any doubt on this subject, we will state here that, after the triumph of the Cross of Constantine, the bishops of the Roman Empire were empowered by the civil code to hear and decide cases, even between the laity; and the canon law made it obligatory on the part of the clergy to submit their disputes to their respective diocesans. Moreover, Dr. Lingard tells us, that Ethelbert published a code of laws to regulate the administration of justice, and that for this code he was largely indebted to the suggestions of the missionaries, *who were accustomed to the forms and decisions of Roman jurisprudence*. Therefore canonists and civilians, more or less skilled, Augustine and his followers landed in Britain; and we hazard nothing in saying that their successors, through the centuries until the edifice of English liberty was almost complete, possessed the same knowledge and used it with the same prudence and zeal.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to form some idea of the civil law, and, for this purpose, we cannot do better than quote the words of our own Kent. In the twenty-third lecture of his "Commentaries" he says: "The civil law shows the proof of the

highest cultivation and refinement, and no one who peruses it can well avoid the conviction that it has been the fruitful source of those comprehensive views and solid principles which have been applied to elevate and adorn the jurisprudence of modern nations. . . . The whole body of the civil law will excite never-failing curiosity, and receive the homage of scholars, as a singular monument of wisdom. It fills such a large space in the eye of human reason; it regulates so many interests of man as a social and civilized being; it embodies so much thought, reflection, experience, and labor; it leads us so far into the recesses of antiquity, and it has stood so long against the waves and weathers of time, that it is impossible, while engaged in the contemplation of the system, not to be struck with some portion of the awe and veneration which are felt in the midst of the solitudes of a majestic ruin." According to the profound Balmes, this law was enriched by the writings of the early fathers, and after the conversion of Constantine, when Catholic doctrines were upheld by imperial authority, it received some of its most enduring and salutary principles from the Church.

Of the canon law, in the days of Gregory IX., away back in 1234, the learned, but by no means unprejudiced, Hallam, historian and jurist, says: "In these books (the five books of Decretals) we find a regular and copious system of jurisprudence, derived in a great measure from the civil law, but with considerable deviation, and possibly improvement." ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 3.)

With a knowledge of these two systems of jurisprudence, so highly spoken of by such profound scholars and jurists, how great must have been the influence exercised on government and legislation by the missionaries and their successors, especially when we consider the ascendancy which they gained by virtue of their spiritual ministrations and power? Even in the absence of direct testimony, a contrary supposition would be monstrous. It would be equivalent to saying that Christianity was a fraud, or, that its ministers were ignorant or degraded. We know, however, that from the day that the heptarchy surrendered to the spiritual supremacy of Augustine, until the robber banner of the Norman triumphed at Hastings, the Anglo-Saxons, from the throne to the hovel, heeded the teachings of the Church. And, for that age, a most enlightened Church, indeed—the Church of a Bede and Alcuin—a Church whose monasteries and nunneries numbered more kings, princes, nobles, queens, and princesses, than in the same space of time, with the same population, were ever known in any other country. Misfortune did not impel them to enter the cloister, as happened in lands less favored by heaven. The thirty kings and queens who, within two hundred years, laid aside their crowns to serve God in chastity, poverty, and obedience, did so when no

shadow rested on their thrones. From these facts it must be apparent that the Church had vast control, and it is safe to assume that her treasures of knowledge were used for the enlightenment and liberty of the people.

Much has been written, much spoken, regarding the customs and laws of the Anglo-Saxons, yet it must be confessed that there is not a great deal of accurate information possessed on the subject, even by the most painstaking antiquaries. "Every account of the civil polity of the Anglo-Saxons," says Dr. Lingard, "must necessarily be imperfect. We can only view the subject through the intervening gloom of eight centuries; and the faint light which is furnished by imperfect notices, scattered hints and partial descriptions, may serve to irritate, but not to satisfy curiosity. It would be in vain to seek for information in the works of foreign writers, and the native historians never imagined that it could be requisite to delineate institutions with which they had been familiarized from their childhood, and which they naturally judged would be perpetuated along with their posterity" ("History of England," vol. i., page 190).

A collection of the laws was said to have been made in the reign of Alfred, known as the *Dom Bok* or "*Liber Judicialis*," and another in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and designated the "*Leges Eduardi*." During the rule of the Normans and the early Plantagenets, the "*Leges Eduardi*" were frequently referred to as containing all that was desirable, and their confirmation constantly demanded. These collections are lost. Doubtless they were destroyed at the time of the Reformation, when nearly all the learning of the Anglo-Saxons was given to the flames; an excellent preparation for the reign of absolutism in religion as in government. Tynell, in his "*History of England*," page 152, says: "From the conversion of the Saxons most of the laws made in the *witenagemote*, or great councils, were carefully preserved, and would have been conveyed to us more entire had it not been for the loss of so many curious monuments of antiquity at the suppression of monasteries, in the reign of King Henry VIII. Florence of Worcester and William of Malmesbury claim that their histories are copied from monastic chronicles, in which much that appertained to the customs, laws, government and history of the Anglo-Saxons was carefully recorded. Valuable indeed as were these chronicles, and lamentable as was their destruction, had they been preserved they would not have done justice to the usages and legislation of the time. Judge Cooly remarks: "In estimating the proportion that Saxon usages contributed to the formation of English law, it would be too limited a view if we should take into account only the records now extant of particular laws and forms of proceeding.

These records are imperfect, and even if we had the entire body of laws so far as they were ever reduced to writing, it would furnish but a part of what then existed and was perpetuated, and again it would be leaving out the self-developing power inherent in the habits of the people" (*"American Cyclopædia,"* vol. i., page 147).

History and tradition combine in ascribing a rare degree of excellence to the customs and laws of that period; and it is the verdict of both that it was then that the foundation of English liberty was laid, and that all that has since been obtained is little more than confirmation or commentary. If, therefore, we would form a just estimate of the liberties enjoyed by Englishmen, we should bend all our mental energies to the study of Catholic England, the England that Augustine and his successors, up to the time when the soul of the good King Edward took its flight to Heaven, had made the brightest gem in the tiara of Peter, and to which they had given a system of jurisprudence that is as admirable, as the Church from which it sprung is imperishable.

Alexis De Tocqueville, in his *"Democracy in America,"* remarks that the entire man is to be seen in the cradle of the child, that we must know the child if we would understand the passions and the virtues that will rule his life, and that there is something analogous to this in the growth of nations. The Saxon child is the Englishman of to day grown to advanced manhood. English society is a growth and development of Anglo-Saxon society, and as such should be regarded, if we would understandingly read it.

As it is not our purpose to follow the order of historical events, or to attempt any learned discussion of the growth of the English Constitution, but to emphasize a few leading facts regarding fundamental rights and to cite authorities bearing on them, we will pass over much that is of interest and that might be relevant.

The power of the Church, after the Anglo-Saxon period, was contested, and, to some extent, controlled, during the long interval between the year 1066 and the reign of Henry VIII., when it was not only disregarded but trampled on. The new dynasty could ill brook the salutary restraints that such prelates as Anselm of Canterbury sought to impose. By injustice it had triumphed, and by injustice it would continue triumphant. In the time of William the Conqueror and his sons, the native Church, as well as the natives, was proscribed, and only foreign ecclesiastics were intrusted with exalted positions. Hallam, the historian of the Middle Ages and of the English Constitution, says that for a hundred years after the conquest, natives were not appointed to offices of trust or emolument in State or Church, and Lord Lyttleton, in his history of Henry II., affirms that Becket was the first Englishman who reached an exalted station.

The foreign ecclesiastics, however, did not always prove as pliable as was expected; and when they began to see that the robbers were not very particular about whose property they appropriated or whose rights they disregarded, when they began to see that they were to be made accomplices in crime, a change took place which antagonized Church and State, hitherto so harmonious. Then commenced a contest, bitter and unrelenting, in which all the forces of barbaric power, all the passions of corrupt nature, were arrayed against religion, virtue, intelligence and law. The patrimony of the Church, when the Anglo-Saxon population had been despoiled, became the object of artifice and even violence. Its revenues were appropriated and squandered in riot and debauchery. Prelates eminent for their learning and sanctity, men whose virtues and attainments would shed lustre on any age, were driven from their sees, and compelled to live on charity in distant lands. They had no alternative between poverty in exile and degradation, and, like Anselm, they chose the former. Who can read, even at this distance, of the indignities heaped upon this great prelate, without a feeling of intense indignation at the barbarity and fiendish passions that held carnival on thrones and in palaces? And later, what more horribly shocking than the inhumanity of Henry II. towards Thomas à Becket, for refusing his consent to Constitutions that would make the Church the slave of the State, that would destroy the independence of the ecclesiastical court, and change it, from being the most enlightened in Europe, to a thing of ridicule and contempt. As we look at the life of this illustrious man, at its persecutions and indignities, we are led, from a natural point of view, to regard his assassination in the light of a deliverance.

Thank God, through all that trying period, there were never wanting Anselms, Theobalds, Becket, and Langtons in the high places to bless and cheer the people in their efforts to be free, or, as they put it, to win back "the customs and laws of the good king Edward." The struggle was dreary, protracted, and often bloody. Shoulder to shoulder with them, in that struggle, were their own clergy—the clergy who sprang from them, who were bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, and who were bound to them by every tie, as well as by a common cause. Shoulder to shoulder, triumph came; real triumph, not its semblance, as in the charters of Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II. Shoulder to shoulder, in spite of every power of darkness, England continues to be Saxon, and the *Leges Eduardi* find an equivalent in the *Magna Charta* wrung from the royal ruffian John by "the army of God and of the Holy Church."

A recent writer in the "Harvard Law Review," a review that in the domain of legal science is second to none in this or any other country, remarks: "In one aspect the *Magna Charta* represents

an end and consummation, in another a beginning. It was, for the most part, a compilation of the ancient customs of the realm, or the laws of king Edward the Confessor, as they existed before the Norman conquest. On the other hand, it was the first great declaration of the rights of the new nation, the various elements of which several causes had combined to unite and consolidate, and from this time forth the constant demand of the people is for a confirmation not of the *Leges Eduardi* but of the *Magna Charta*." ("Harvard Law Review," March, 1891, page 370.)

So important was this charter considered by our Catholic ancestors, that, according to Dr. Lingard, the most painstaking and accurate of English historians, it was confirmed thirty-eight times—by Henry III., six times; by Edward I., three times; by Edward III., fifteen times; by Richard II., six times; by Henry IV., six times; by Henry V., once, and by Henry VI., once.

Though the *Magna Charta* swept away many great abuses—though it secured a speedy administration of justice, established the court of common pleas at Westminster, facilitated the trial of issues, made justice easy to all with as little expense as possible in those days, corrected abuses in trials by wager of law and of battle, gave a new impetus to commerce, enjoined uniformity in weights and measures, placed on a secure basis the liberties of all the cities, towns, burghs, and ports, guaranteed the rights of the Church, provided "that every liberty and custom which the king had granted to his tenants, as far as concerned him, should be observed by the clergy and laity towards their tenants, as far as concerned them"—though these and many other rights and privileges were secured, the most material feature is the thirty-ninth article, from which the life, liberty, and property clauses of our American constitution are not only derived but copied.

The rights guaranteed by this article were always recognized by the common law, and classed as absolute, but they were often lost sight of by kings and barons.

As it is the foundation of civil freedom in England, and as it is incorporated in our constitution, we give it in the form in which the dastard tyrant signed it: "*Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut dissaisiatur, aut utlagetur, aut exuletur, aut aliquomodo destruatur, nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus, nisi per legale iudicium parium suorum, vel per legem terrae.*" (Stubbs' "Select Charters," 301.) "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or banished, or any ways destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon him, unless by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

Blackstone, commenting on this, maintains that the right of life is secured by the words *nullus liber homo aliquo modo destruatur*,

that the right of personal liberty is secured by *capiatur vel imprisonetur*, and property by *dissaisiatur de libero tenemento*. The words after *dissaisiatur* are found in the confirmatory statute of 9 Henry III., and are merely explanatory.

Placing ourselves in touch with the age of king John, glancing at the past and looking out into the future, too much cannot be said in praise of the *Magna Charta*. Many have considered that its admirers have overrated it—that it has not exercised the influence on the Anglo-Saxon race which is claimed for it. Hallam, averse as he was to do justice to the Church during the formative period of English liberty and law, does not hesitate to say, that it is still the keystone of British liberty, and that “all that has since been obtained is little more than as confirmation, or commentary—that if every subsequent law were to be swept away, there would still remain the bold features that distinguish a free from a despotic monarchy.” (“Middle Ages,” vol. ii., p. 116.)

It was not, as some suppose, obtained by the Church and the barons solely, and for their exclusive benefit. The Langtons and Pembrokes were not alone. Back of them were the people, the new nation, and they were partakers alike of the glory of its achievement and of its benefits. It secured to all freemen their fundamental rights, rights which always existed in theory, and declared that they could not be deprived of them unless by the legal judgment of their peers or by the law of the land.

Moreover the *villeins*, then numerous, and in their then condition exempted from its benefits, were not without hope. The merging of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon, the weakening of the bonds of feudalism, the advance of the new nation, the community of interests, of aspirations, of privileges between the aristocracy and the large and prosperous element known as freemen, were destined to have a salutary bearing on their condition. The promised land from that moment was in view. Freedom was not only possible but probable. It came gradually, and with it all the rights and privileges of the *Magna Charta*.

It is important, especially in the light of subsequent events, to remark that while theoretically the monarchs of England were never absolute, practically all the monarchs from the Conqueror down were little else. The *Magna Charta* sealed the doom of absolutism by establishing the supremacy of the law, and the forces which led to it made perilous its violation. It was these forces that gave it vitality and permanence; that continued its life without gap or interval; that made it a rallying cry in after days, as the “*Leges Eduardi*” had been during the long gloom of Anglo-Saxon bondage; that led to the formation of a House of Commons, which still exists, and that enabled the learned Hallam,

ages later, to say: "I know not whether there are any essential privileges of our countrymen, any fundamental securities against arbitrary power, so far as they depend upon positive institution, which may not be traced to the time when the house of Plantagenet filled the English throne" ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 401).

The other great bulwarks of English liberty are the Petition of Rights, the *Habeas Corpus* and the Bill of Rights. These, in their essential features, are contained in Magna Charta. It is not claimed that there is anything in them startlingly new, anything deserving of much note that had not come down from Catholic times, and that was not incorporated with the common law in the days of the Anglo-Saxons and the Plantagenets. The cause for the demand of these securities was that the law as it existed before the Tudors and Stuarts was defied and trampled on, and it was urged that they were merely a re-assertion, in a more specific manner, of rights often, it is true, violated, but always proclaimed and never denied in theory. Now, when these measures were proposed, the very theory was assailed, and the omnipotence of monarchs defended and reduced to practice. All the checks which the wisdom of Catholics had placed on royal authority had been disregarded. The rights of Parliament were treated with contempt; life, liberty and property were subject to the caprices, the passions and the barbarity of a tyranny that deluged England in blood and tears.

The principles prevalent in the time of the Tudors and Stuarts, so far as kingly power was concerned, were founded on no legal precedents, were sanctioned by no legislation, remote or immediate, but were in conflict with the aspirations and usages of the Anglo-Saxon race from the time of the missionary Augustine to the time of the apostate Henry VIII. "The sweeping maxims of absolute power," says Hallam, "which servile judges and churchmen taught the Tudor and Stuart princes, made no progress under the Plantagenet line" ("Middle Ages," vol. ii., page 132).

This opinion of Hallam is sustained by the authority of Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench under Henry VI., in a work entitled "*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*," which was written especially for the instruction of a prince who expected to succeed to the throne. With a few citations from it, bearing on the rights and duties of the king, we close this branch of our subject. In the ninth chapter he discourses as follows: "A king of England cannot at his pleasure make any alterations in the laws of the land, for the nature of his government is not only regal but political. Had it been merely regal, he would have a power to make what innovations and alterations he pleased in the laws of the

kingdom, impose tallages and other hardships upon the people, whether they would or no, without their consent, which sort of government the civil laws point out when they declare *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem*. But it is much otherwise with a king whose government is political, because he can neither make any alteration or change in the laws of the realm without the consent of the subjects, nor burden them against their wills with strange impositions; so that a people governed by such laws as are made with their own consent and approbation, enjoy their properties securely and without the hazard of being deprived of them, by the king or any other. The same thing may be effected under an absolute prince, provided he do not degenerate into the tyrant. Of such a prince Aristotle, in the third of his 'Politics,' says, 'It is better for a city to be governed by a good man than by good laws.' But because it does not always happen that the person presiding over a people is so qualified, St. Thomas, in the book which he wrote to the king of Cyprus, 'De Regimine Principum,' wishes that a kingdom could be so instituted as that the king might not be at liberty to tyrannize over his people, which only comes to pass in the present case; that is, when the sovereign power is restrained by political laws. Rejoice, therefore, my good prince, that such is the law of the kingdom you are to inherit, because it will afford, both to yourself and subjects, the greatest security and satisfaction." In the thirteenth chapter he says: "As the head of a body natural cannot change its nerves and sinews, cannot deny to the several parts their proper energy, their due proportion and aliment of blood; neither can a king, who is the head of a body politic, change the laws thereof, nor take from the people what is theirs by right against their consent. Thus you have, sir, the formal institution of every political kingdom, from which you may guess at the power which a king may exercise with respect to the laws and the subject; for he is appointed to protect his subjects in their lives, properties and laws. For this very end and purpose he has the delegation of power from the people, and he has no just claim to any other power but this." Had this doctrine prevailed in the time of the Tudors and Stuarts, Charles would have retained his head, and countless lives and treasure would have been saved.

From what has been urged, it must be apparent that the English Constitution had reached almost its present perfection while England was Catholic. Now there are, and there always have been, men of various grades of intelligence who attribute this happy consummation to the development of the principles and institutions of the Germanic race, the race that made such short work of Roman civilization before the coming of Augustine. There is no foundation in fact for this assertion. It is not only

unhistorical, but irrational. In the writings of Tacitus, it is true, some things may be found that would give color to it; but when the historian's utterances are rightly understood, the fabric raised on them falls to the ground. When Tacitus wrote, conjugal fidelity in Rome was regarded as idiocy, and married women boasted of their change of husbands and of their general profligacy. Trajan, the best of the Roman emperors, was steeped in debauchery. Lechery rioted and rotted in the high places, and in order to check it the historian presents an ideal picture from the German forests that is historically misleading. From this picture, which his own admissions blur, reverence for the marriage tie and respect for woman, so general throughout Europe in the ages of faith, it is argued, came not from Christianity, but from the forest-home of barbarians.

What ground is there for it? Nothing more than the superstitious veneration paid to their goddess, Velleda. As well argue that the marriage relation was respected and that woman was held in high esteem in Rome because the Vestals were sacred, or that the domestic relations of the French were singularly pure, because they worshipped a female in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. Surely there is nothing in this whereon to build an argument, or that would take from Christianity the credit of erecting the two main pillars which support the edifice of European civilization. While we may be willing to admit that the barbarians of Tacitus, who, we are told, kept several wives, not for lust, but for distinction, had some correct ideas on the marriage relation and the dignity of woman, it is not at all probable that their manners were improved by time. Their contact with Romans did not tend to the development of this or any other element of moral duty.

When Vortigern was pressed by Pict and Scot, there was no Tacitus to extol their virtues, but there very many like Sidonius, Bishop of Clermont, who exclaimed: "Happy your eyes who do not see them; happy your ears who do not hear them." Of all the tribes that composed the German race, none was more formidable, none more savage than the Saxons, whom this unfortunate monarch, in the year 449, enlisted in his service. For centuries they were the scourge of surrounding nations, pillage and piracy being their means of livelihood. In brief, they were barbarians, robbers, idolators, slave makers, slave owners, slave dealers, thoroughly illiterate and inhumanly cruel. Such they remained until Christianity, borne on the wings of love, came to regenerate and transform them. That it succeeded we have seen, and also that to its success is attributable not only the wisdom of their customs, laws and institutions, but their continuance on the land which their injustice had wrung from its rightful owners. The

spirit of the Church was felt in the *witenagemote*, in the *hundred-gemote* and in the *scyre-gemote*; in other words, in the legislature and the courts. The school, the college, the pulpit and the confessional gave it almost absolute sway over the minds and hearts of the people, and this sway was exercised for their elevation. Viewing these powers, and bearing in mind what the Anglo-Saxon was before his conversion, how absurd is any hypothesis that would deprive the Church of whatever there is to be found of beauty and grandeur in the laws and customs of Alfred, of Edgar and of Edward, monarchs whose lives shine like stars in the diadem of Christian Rome, and whose impression on the Constitution of England has not been, and cannot be, effaced.

To pass from the Anglo-Saxon to the Dane is like steering from Charybdis to Scylla. The Dane was robbery, lust and murder personified. His life was dedicated to crime from the cradle. At his mother's breast he was taught to emulate, by land and sea, the atrocities of his ancestors, and to despise honest industry. To form an estimate of him, it is unnecessary to follow his pirate banner wherever booty beckoned, for the history of England sufficiently attests his cupidity, selfishness and brutality. Had not the Church conquered him, the Anglo-Saxon would, in all probability, have shared the fate of the Briton. That it did conquer him is the best evidence of the power it had on the mind, heart, manners, customs and laws of the people within its fold.

Nor will the advent of the Norman help those who reject the claims of the Church. With the volume of history open before us, we have no hesitancy in saying that a blacker villain never polluted the moral atmosphere of any nation. Take from him the glamour which poets and romancists have thrown around him and he stands before us the colossal ruffian of the ages. With some show of religion in hours of weakness and danger, he was the embodiment of bloodthirstiness and selfishness, as, in health and strength, he rode forth on prancing steed. His heart was as impenetrable as his armor, and his hand as merciless as the pestilence. If sometimes he exhibited the qualities of the Grecian athlete or the Roman gladiator, he was oftener the cowardly assassin and the ruthless destroyer of the helpless and innocent. What the wolf is to the sheep was he to the people, and had not the Church grappled with him, not a stone upon a stone of the grand edifice of civilization, which it took her centuries to rear, would have remained. Never did the Church put forth more power. All her resources of head and heart, all her treasures of human and divine knowledge were called into requisition, and she needed them all. Hitherto she had open, courageous enemies; but the Norman fought her and her children often wearing the mask of the sanctuary, and sometimes involving the sanctuary in his crimes.

But, grant that he was all that his most extravagant eulogists claim for him; deck him in the gaudy trappings of romance; drink in the songs of the troubadours; let imagination take wing until he stands before you the soul of all that is generous, noble, valorous, the very personification of chivalry, and you but multiply the glories and triumphs, the laurels and trophies of the Church; for, when she measured forces with him, he was reeking in every crime to which humanity is heir, the equal in iniquity of his Danish brother. How prophetic the tears shed by Charlemagne, as, standing by the waves of the Mediterranean, he descried the vessels of him who, in this age, would be called the enemy of mankind.

Now it must be evident, even to the merest historical smatterer, that these tribes or nations, as the Church met and confronted them, were not only incapable of bringing English liberty to that degree of perfection which, according to Hallam, it had attained before the sceptre passed from the Plantagenets, but that, owing to their selfish motives of action, their restlessness, their hatred of restraint, their passions, they were utterly unfit to form any permanent government.

Guizot, in his third lecture, after ascribing to the barbarians, to whom he was partial, the sentiment of personal liberty, of human individualism, says: "In a state of extreme rudeness and ignorance, this sentiment is mere selfishness, in all its brutality; with all its unsociability. Such was its character from the fifth to the eighth century among the Germans. They cared for nothing beyond their own interests, for nothing beyond the gratification of their own passions, their own inclinations; how, then, could they accommodate themselves, in any tolerable degree, to the social condition? The attempt was made to bring them into it; they endeavored of themselves to enter into it; but an act of providence, a burst of passion, a lack of intelligence, soon threw them back to their old position. At every instant, we see attempts made to form man into a social state, and at every instant we see them overthrown by the failings of man, by the absence of the moral conditions necessary to its existence." Further on, in the same lecture, speaking of the causes that led to the termination of this state, we find the following just tribute to the Church: "A third cause, and one which readily presents itself to every one, was the Christian Church. The Christian Church was a regularly constituted society; having its maxims, its rules, its discipline, together with an ardent desire to extend its influence, to conquer its conquerors. Among the Christians of this period, in the Catholic clergy there were men of profound and varied learning; men who had thought deeply, who were versed in ethics and politics; who had formed definite opinions and vigorous notions

upon all subjects; who felt a praiseworthy zeal to propagate information, and to advance the cause of learning. No society ever made greater efforts than the Christian Church did, from the fifth to the tenth century, to influence the world around it, and to assimilate it to itself."

That the Church did assimilate to itself Anglo-Saxon, Dane, and Norman, admits of no doubt; and that, to this assimilation, however imperfect, alone belongs the glory of placing the liberties of England on a permanent basis, and of creating a system of jurisprudence that will live centuries after Macaulay's New Zealander, to bless the world, only folly or ignorance would question. Any other position, as we have said, and essayed to show, is unhistorical and irrational.

MICHAEL HENNESSY.

ENGLISH KINGS AND ROMAN PONTIFFS.

England and Rome; a History of the Relations between the Papacy and the English State and Church, from the Norman Conquest to the Revolution of 1688. By T. Dunbar Ingram, LL.D.

Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment; by Lord Selborne.

IT is the misfortune of persons born in a National Church that they cannot grasp the idea of the Catholic Church. Their view is necessarily insular, fragmentary. Accustomed always to regard religion as opinionative,—for the logical reason that their Christianity is home made,—they argue about the Catholic Church as if it were only one of many churches which, eclectically, borrows some good points out of the others. In the two publications named above, we find the usual Protestant view of Roman corruptions. Mr. Ingram, who is a barrister, and who is well read in special grooves, holds a brief for the Anglican High Church Protestant party, and he does his duty to his client, and does it well. Lord Selborne thoroughly understands what he is writing about, within the limits of *ex parte* litigation. But neither the one nor the other can "take a bird's-eye view of the whole idea," because neither happened to be born inside the Church. Had they been born Catholics, or had they been converted to the faith, they might perhaps have reasoned in the following way :

The Catholic Church was founded by her Divine Lord, not for one race or nation but for the whole world. National Churches, therefore, integral in their own selves,—independent of the one supreme Teaching Authority,—are the exact opposite of the Idea, the Catholic Church. One God, one faith, one Visible, United Church is the Idea, as it is the fact, of Christianity. Now the very object of the Catholic Church being to unite all souls in one faith, the essential nature of the Catholic Church being divine, it follows that the Catholic Church and the world must be necessarily and always in antagonism. The Church represents obedience to the Divine Mind; the world represents obedience to the natural mind; hence it would be impossible in the nature of things that, through eighteen hundred and ninety-two years, the two powers should not be always in conflict. Just as a man's soul and body are always in conflict, each trying to persuade the other to its own side, so the spiritual and temporal powers must be always liable to get into conflict, since temporal powers are largely grounded on worldly principles. What wonder then that, in well-nigh two thousand years, there should have been well-nigh two thousand bitter struggles between the power which represents Almighty God and the power which represents original sin.

Yet both Mr. Ingram and Lord Selborne ignore a necessity which is at once the result of the activities of the Evil One, and of the exercise of the Church's power for his overthrow. If there were *not* perpetual conflicts, the Church would not be divine. Like her Founder, the Church is a Teacher; she instructs, she admonishes, she threatens; and when all gentle measures fail, she excommunicates, yet always in the hope of reconciliation. It is precisely with powers as with persons; with the collective force of a government as with its subjects. The Church is placed in the world to protect the nations against tyrants; to use all her spiritual weapons for their security; and, conversely, through eighteen centuries, bishops, priests and laity have looked to the Holy See to defend their liberties. Why, then, throw the blame on Catholic authority, because many natural misunderstandings have arisen between pontiffs and kings, between national hierarchies and their civil governors, between the often powerless religious orders and great nobles, seeing that the very object of the spiritual power, both as regards nations and individuals, is to bring good influences to counteract evil ones.

Nor is it any excuse to say: "But the spiritual power has not unfrequently been injudicious." Protestant critics forget that, during the Middle Ages, the tactical difficulties of the pontiffs were often cruel. Removed by immense distance from the scenes of conflicts, where feudal lords or worldly monarchs were running

riot; fearing to offend those in power lest they should injure the liberties of their dependents, and knowing well that their insistence on what was right must be tempered by at least the semblance of compromise, they were often made to seem to side with wrong from their eagerness to avoid harming whole communities. Mr. Ingram speaks of the moral corruptions of some of the clergy, such as the abuse of simony, of non-residence, of plural benefices, or the abuses in expectations and reservations, as though the ecclesiastical authorities were solely responsible for a state of things which was as world-begotten as it was infinitely regrettable. No one denies the existence of such abuses,—their magnitude has of course been over-stated, while the holy side of the Church's influence has not been dwelt upon,—yet the answer is that, for centuries, the feudal power was so dominant that the ecclesiastical power had to fight against great odds. A fair question is: If even the Catholic Church was often powerless in restraining the worldly propensities of great nobles, what would weak Protestantism have effected under the same conditions? Spiritual rule had to contend against brute force. Accepted principles had to contend against accepted facts. A distant pontiff had to decide on delicate questions, involving the class-privileges of established lords, and, while advancing every moral motive for reform, had to be careful not to foment social discord. In these days we can scarcely realize the whole difficulties of the very distant and solely spiritual Supreme Pontiffs. The refinements of pontifical tact were terribly tasked. It is scarcely fair of Mr. Ingram to bring so broad an accusation as "The Popes recognized no distinction between things secular and sacred." Such a remark betrays an animus which is unfitting in a careful writer, who should put the proper share of the blame on the right shoulders.

And another truth which this class of writers overlook is that the Catholic Church has its human side and its divine side; its human side being its fallibility in worldly prudence, and its divine side its infallibility in faith and morals. Mr. Ingram does not say a word against the divine side of the Catholic Church; he only says a good deal against its human side. And wholly apart from the fact that he makes statements as to the human side which we should pronounce to be, in mild language, misapprehensive, we may say frankly that no one who is not a Catholic can distinguish between the human side and the divine side. The points of contact between the Church and the world are so confused by the noisy wickedness of the latter, that unless a man be both Catholic saint and theologian he cannot write down the definitions of such points. We have all seen a ship tumbled about by angry waves, the captain trimming his sails or changing his course; and though we may

know that the captain is a master of navigation, we know also that he cannot change the wind or sea, and that his science, his fortitude, his pure intention are no pledges that he may not be worsted. How much more difficult is the conflict of the Church with the world; the wind blowing from all quarters, not from one quarter; deception, mendacity, trickery, immorality, all contending together in human storm; while the spiritual power has to do two things apparently irreconcilable—insist on right principles and assuage enmities. In eighteen hundred years, while these conflicts have been going on,—conflicts between divine principles and human wickedness, between holy suggestion and stubborn pride, between the saintly diplomacy of Catholic authority and the crafty intrigues of secular statesmen or courtiers,—the wonder is, not that there have been some scandals, but that the Catholic Church has come out of the long fray with no worse injury than wordy blows.

II.

After all, what was the controversy which was always raging—the controversy between the spiritual and the temporal? Was it a controversy about the *possession* of spiritual powers, or a controversy only as to their *exercise*? It was the latter. No king or noble, before Henry VIII., disputed the Church's possession of spiritual powers—including the spiritual primacy of the Holy See. The whole controversy was always, as Father S. F. Smith, S. J., has clearly put it, on the question of the "frontiers" of the two powers. Those two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, were, as we have said, necessarily in conflict; the only grounds of quarrel being "where is the frontier line?" and "who shall judge its delicate limitations?" Now it is manifest to common sense that, since the powers of the Catholic Church are superior to the powers of earthly sovereigns—superior because the divine is above the human—therefore also the Catholic Church must be sole arbiter on the subject of the limitations of her spiritual frontier. This truth was normally admitted by kings and nations, as a truth which, in the abstract, was undeniable. But where the controversy derived its bitterness was from this pleading: that the temporal power would urge that the spiritual power had misunderstood what were the exact bearings of a particular case in dispute, and on this plea would proceed to contest, not the legitimacy of the spiritual power, but the legitimacy of its exercise under a misapprehension.

It was always an axiom with the Church, as it was an axiom with the Catholic States, that temporal sovereignties were independent as to things temporal. The Church never dreamed of interfering with temporal matters, any more than did Catholic States

with things spiritual. The whole dispute was always: "is this your province or is it mine?" or to put it with better accuracy: "have you sufficiently understood the premises, to make sure under which province this point comes?" And seeing that, up to the other day, the means of inter-communication were most difficult—no steam, no electricity, not even roads—it was a matter of course that the long intervals of inter-communication should be utilized "diplomatically" by worldly suitors. It was so easy to misrepresent the real issue. Two parties in a home-suit, each employing their advocates, could manage to confuse a cause at Rome so successfully, that it is a marvel how the pontiffs could have been so well informed as they were through the centuries of such long drawn out controversies.

This point being admitted, we may now ask the question, was there ever any controversy in which the pontiffs made the mistake of over-stepping their (acknowledged) spiritual power? After reading the two books mentioned above, it is a permissible inference, there was not. Misunderstandings, and a great many of them; withdrawals of censures, not made on assured grounds; errors of judgment as to the best time or means; all such "human side" of the Church's actions may be legitimately discussed; with the conclusion that there were sometimes grave mistakes; but in all English history (and it is of England that our two authors write), we may assert that there is no instance of a Pope stultifying his divine office, by confusing divine principles with human principles.

III.

If there were such an instance, when was it? Shall we say that we might look for incentives to such "stultification" in one or other of the five following grooves: (1) in the contests of a sovereign with a pontiff; (2) in the contests of a sovereign with English bishops; (3) in the contests of English bishops with a pontiff; (4) in the contests of English Catholics with their bishops; (5) in the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff. Let us run down English history, and briefly touch on such instances, as *primâ facie*, might afford pleas for accusation.

The first contest on which Anglicans lay stress is in regard to the keeping of Easter in the sixth century. (This was before the time of the Norman kings, but since the contest is assumed to come under the category of "the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff"—more accurately of the scattered British Catholics with a missionary—we may discuss the case as included within our argument). It will not be necessary however to say much about it, for the subject was alluded to in a recent paper in this

REVIEW (under the title of "The Anglican Theory of Continuity"), and we need therefore only make the following remark: The Roman pontiffs never insisted on the abandoning of national *customs*, provided only such customs were thoroughly Christian. Thus Pope St. Gregory himself, who sent Augustine to England, charged him, "You know the custom of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. It pleases me that if you have found anything in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make observance of the same." And again, the same Pope said, "Where the faith is one, differences of custom do not damage Holy Church." Now this "liberality" is misunderstood by such Anglicans as confuse local customs with points of faith. The contest of the Britons with Augustine, while it is sufficiently explicable by the angry times in which they lived, was no more "a contest of English bishops with a pontiff," or of English or British Catholics with a pontiff, than would have been the refusal of British priests to wear the tonsure—like the Roman priests; to fast on Saturdays as well as on Fridays—like the Romans; or to place a cross on the front instead of on the back of a Mass-vestment, according to the "custom" still preserved throughout Italy. Not one Anglican in a thousand cares to remember such distinctions; to note the difference between national habits and Catholic faith; just as not one Anglican in a thousand cares to note the historic fact, that the British Easter was the original Roman Easter. And it is perhaps well that we should begin our survey with an example of a contest which obviously did not rest on faith or morals; for we have to show that no contest in English history ever rested upon either (that is, upon definitions of either); all contests being as to limitation of frontier; as to the over-stepping of the frontier by either litigant.

Before, however, we come to the Conquest, let three remarks be made, in regard to the early kings and the early Church. (1) In the Calendar of the Old English Church, we find the names of (about) three hundred canonized saints; more than half of whom were of royal birth or connection. Now canonization has always been Rome-conferred; and we may be quite sure that no prince would have been canonized, nor indeed any person of either sex or of any degree, unless he, or she, had been loyal to the Holy See. (2) Monasteries and convents were built all over England for a long while before the time of the Conquest; and from these religious houses were diffused religion and education; Glastonbury Ely, Ramsey, Malmesbury, with many others, suggesting memories of early pontifical jurisdiction. Now these religious houses were approved, and often endowed, by the kings in whose domin-

ions they were established. So that their existence may be said to show two things—both of them very pertinent to our argument—that the religion of early England was Roman Catholic, and that the early English kings were of the same faith. (3) It was before the Conquest that St. Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, reprov'd the vices of the tyrant king Edwy; and subsequently the same archbishop reprov'd Edwy's successor, Edgar; and even obliged him, by way of penance, to lay aside his crown for seven years, to fast twice a week, and to distribute copies of the Holy Scriptures to every county. Now we shall not be straining a point if we go so far as to say, that such a fact proves that all England was Roman Catholic. To imagine that any Archbishop who was an "Anglican" could have ventured to inflict such chastisement upon his king, is as absurd as to suppose that a king who was a Protestant would have submitted to such outrageous presumption. To gravely argue such an "Anglican case" would provoke a smile. We therefore conclude that a king's obedience to an archbishop proves all that we have any need to prove in our argument. Just as the sanctity which could merit canonization; and the canonization itself, Rome-conferred; with the existence of religious houses all over England, were sufficient evidence of the Roman pontiffs' jurisdiction, so the bold defiance of a king by an archbishop, with the subsequent submission of that king to the imposed penance, are proof positive that the spiritual power was Roman Catholic.

We come now to the days of the Norman conquest. In the historic resistances of the archbishops Anselm, Winchelsea, and Thomas à Becket, who all warred with the sovereigns of their day, we find no contest as to doctrine, as to morals, nor even to discipline; we find only pretexts set up by the temporal power for the evasion of the acknowledged rights of the spiritual power. In the case of St. Anselm, let it be first asked, who were his enemies, who his friends? King William Rufus was his chief enemy; a would-be emperor, autocrat and tyrant. Yet even he wrote to the Pope that "he deferred to and obeyed his sacred commands with humility" . . . and that in the matter of appeals to the pontiff he only claimed that "no cleric belonging to his kingdom should pass beyond the borders of his kingdom on account of any *civil cause*, unless he had previously ascertained whether he could obtain his rights by the king's authority." This same king who quarrell'd with St. Anselm, in regard to the limits of appeals to the Holy See, also quarrell'd with him because he had recognized Pope Urban as the true Pope; King Rufus pretending to nominate the *Apostolicus*, just as the Emperor of Germany claimed to do so. Here was no sort of assumption of spiritual authority, or of

refusal of that authority to the chief chair, but only a vain, imperial claim to be so mighty that every one must bow down to his authority. Be it remembered that in those times, in England, there were two absolutely independent jurisdictions; each one employing its own means to defend itself from real or from apparent encroachment. The kings used their prohibitions, to prevent hasty recourse to Rome; the pontiffs, in extreme cases, used excommunication, when all other means of settlement had been exhausted. In the subsequent contest about investiture, between St. Anselm and King Henry (and in regard to which Pope Gregory VII. had legislated) the archbishop refused to allow King Henry to confer investiture, or even so much as to hold communion with those clerics to whom he, the king, had given investiture; because the Pope had already legislated on the matter, to avoid confusion of spiritual with temporal claim. The whole country was with St. Anselm in his resistance; mere courtiers only were on the side of King Henry. But the point to be observed is that bishops, priests, and laity were convinced that to receive investiture at the hands of a layman, even though that layman were the king, was the confusing of the temporal with the spiritual; and this confusion was always sought to be avoided by the whole action of the pontiffs in early times. No lay authority denied the spiritual power; no spiritual authority denied the lay power; the contest was between ambitious worldly governors, who desired to magnify their own importance, and faithful clergy who saw the danger that was imminent, and endured persecution to avoid it.

To take a later case in history, when Pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1261, forbade the English clergy to yield to the royal demands on Church property, until the consent of the Holy See had been obtained, Archbishop Winchelsea at once promulgated the Bull. But it appeared good to the English bishops that some concession should be made, because the war with Scotland was occasioning great ravages. Accordingly the bishops represented to the Holy See that some exception might be made in the present need; and the necessary concession was therefore granted. Here was the illustration of three truisms, always transparent in English history: (1) that the Pope claimed all spiritual legislation; (2) that the civil power admitted the claim in principle; (3) that the pontiffs were always willing to grant reasonable concessions, when the whole truth of any case had been put before them.

Every one knows that St. Thomas à Becket was a martyr-champion of the rights of the Holy See; but for what particular right was it that he stood up? Now here we may touch lightly on some "legal" points, by way of estimating the sublime martyrdom of St. Thomas. "The Angel of the Church's liberty," as St.

Thomas has been well called, may well excuse us for dwelling one moment on certain of the major, special difficulties of his career.

IV.

Such words as appeals, investitures, prohibitions, provisors, stir up a confused storm in the mind, when we remember their uses in English history. More wrath has been expended over those uses, and more misapprehension has surrounded their exact force, than have disturbed any other branches of law, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Appeal is a simple word, and every one knows what it means; but we may begin by observing that the very custom of appeal proves the universal recognition of the Pontificate. In the present day there is no spiritual head of the "Established" Church; so there can be no question of purely spiritual appeal, and no question of "prohibitions," on special grounds. In Catholic times the co-existence of two headships, the one purely spiritual and independent, the other purely temporal and independent, necessarily led to occasional friction in *practice*, though seldom to any friction in *principle*. The king had no equal or superior in temporal matters; the Pope had no equal or superior in spiritual matters; prohibition meaning the preventing of carrying "mixed" causes to Rome, on the ground of their being partly temporal causes. William the Conqueror and his two sons introduced certain new "customs"—"wicked customs and liberties," as Matthew of Paris called them, and "dignities detestable in God's eyes," for the simple reason that their worldly greed and pride were in excess of their Catholic aspirations. And from their example arose constant petty controversies, which had scarcely been heard of till the eleventh century; such as questionings as to the authentication of Papal Bulls; as to the rights of presentation to benefices; as to the precise province of an appeal made by clerics: "was it purely spiritual, or also temporal?" And from this temper on the part of a few of the English kings arose the necessity for some of the pontiffs to remonstrate—as did Pope Martin V., A.D. 1426, when he wrote to Archbishop Chicheley about the statutes of provisors and *præmunire*—because "the king had sanctioned laws concerning churches, clerics, and the ecclesiastical state; drawing spiritual and ecclesiastical causes to himself, just as if the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were put in his hands." Thus both sides sometimes contended, not on the divine right of the pontiff, and not on the temporal right of the civil power, but on the points of limitation or application. The clergy too were sometimes so hard driven, in having to obey tyrants in the temporal order, while also obeying pontiffs in the spiritual order, that it was difficult for them to act with sublime fortitude. As some of St. Anselm's clergy

said to him in their grievous dilemma: "We cannot rise to a sublimity of life like yours, or join you in making scorn of the world." Just as the Catholic clergy in the days of Queen Elizabeth had to choose between apostasy and martyrdom, so was it in a minor degree with the Catholic clergy, throughout the reigns of the more worldly of the English monarchs. Yet even these worldly monarchs do not appear to have lost the faith; they only did—what is quite common in the present day—confess to principles while leading faithless lives. These worldly kings did not say "we repudiate the Pope's authority," or "we consider the temporal power to have jurisdiction over the spiritual power" (as both Henry VIII. and Elizabeth boldly affirmed, equally by their deeds and by their words); they only said: "We find it convenient for our self-pleasing, that we should determine the legal exercise of that spiritual power, which, as Catholics, we of course venerate and obey."

And now, to return to St. Thomas à Becket. We only left him that we might the better apprehend the quarrels, which the Norman kings were the first to generate, between Church and State. It was A.D. 1161, when Henry II., the first Plantagenet, appointed his Chancellor, Thomas à Becket, to be archbishop in succession to Archbishop Theobald, who had just died. (The appointment or selection rested with the king, subject to the after-approval of the pontiff.) Annoyed, that his gay and brilliant chancellor became instantly transformed into an ascetic churchman, the king was wroth beyond control when the new archbishop boldly declared himself to be the champion of the ancient liberties of the Church. The "new customs" of the Conqueror and his two sons, which Henry II. chose to call "the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom," were repudiated by Archbishop à Becket, in those plain simple words which conveyed the whole mind of the Catholic Church on the subject: "The spiritual authority of my archbishopric I hold from the Pope, the temporal revenues from the king." Henry had resolved to bring all causes into the Royal Court, equally those of clerics and of laymen; and he summoned the bishops to submit to the "Constitutions of Clarendon," which decreed these four detestable impieties: (1) the king was to dispose of all benefices; (2) to enjoy the revenues of all benefices while vacant; (3) to prevent any cleric from leaving the kingdom without his leave; (4) to insist that appeals from the Primate should be made to the Crown, not, as heretofore, to the Holy See. Armed knights, with drawn swords, stood in the antechamber of the bishops to compel obedience to these new impious statutes. Under fear most of the bishops consented. The Archbishop stood firm in his refusal. "I appeal to the decision of the Pope," he affirmed;

"and under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I now depart." The king banished him straightway from the kingdom. For seven years the Archbishop remained in exile; and then, under a feigned promise from the king, was restored to his country and to his See. Within a very few months of this restoration, the king uttered the too memorable words: "Of all the cowards in my service, is there not one that will rid me of this turbulent priest?" The answer was the terribly historic crime—not surpassed for sacrilege in English history—which secured for the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket a world's homage. And then, in the following year, the king stood in Canterbury Cathedral, with his hand on the Book of the Gospels on the high altar, and swore to abolish all "customs" contrary to the liberty of the Church, and do penance for his own share in the Archbishop's murder.

Now, three points come out here in such clearness that it is enough to note them without adding any comment: (1) Archbishop à Becket was a saint, and he therefore knew what was the mind of the Catholic Church; (2) the Pope had the power—which the whole Christian world conceded to him—of compelling a king's submission to the Holy See; (3) the king, in doing penance at the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, not only confessed to his faith in the Pope's supremacy, but proved that the faith of the whole nation was at least as earnest as his own, since he had to humble himself in the eyes of all his subjects.

Let us now take a glance at another instance of a similar kind—the contest of King John with the Holy See. Perhaps, in this instance we shall trace, even more emphatically, the faith of all Christendom as well as of Britain. The archbishopric of Canterbury being vacant, some of the monks, at the king's command, elected as primate John de Gray, while another party in the same monastery chose their sub-prior, Reginald, and sent him to Rome for confirmation. The pontiff rejected both candidates, and chose in their stead Stephen Langton, whom he consecrated A.D. 1207. John swore that Langton should never re-enter England, and proceeded to seize the lands of the monks of Canterbury. He threatened to pluck out the eyes and to cut off the noses of all who should go to Rome to make appeal; and so mad was he in his hatred of holy things, that the pontiff, as the only resource that was left to him, placed the kingdom of England under an interdict.

For six years two national evils went on—the one the spiritual consequences of the interdict, the other the king's tyranny over his subjects. At length, the pontiff excommunicated the rebel king, who, being worsted in his battle with Philip of France, had

to submit to the conditions which were imposed upon him. Standing in the open air, outside the west door of the cathedral, the king swore to abolish all the "new customs," and to restore the ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward. The cathedral doors were then thrown open to the faithful—the first time after six years of interdict—and High Mass was celebrated in thanksgiving.

Shortly afterwards the English barons exacted from King John the "Great Charter," which was to secure English liberties. Of this Charter, it suffices to name only the concessions which, directly or indirectly, affected religion; namely, that the Church was to be free in all things spiritual, and to enjoy her old liberties as before the Conquest. Needless to enter here into the story of the misunderstanding between the Pontiff, the king, and his barons, or to detail the horrors of the king's enmity against the bishops, the barons, and the poor monks; the wretched tyrant died in the heat of his antagonism, so that peace came by his death to the Church and nation. We trace here, as in the instance of St. Thomas à Becket, the grand historic fact of English faithfulness. We are told by Anglican writers—of whom we have specially referred to two—that the Reformation was but a recurrence to that demand for freedom which was almost national in its range and its emphasis, for, did not the conqueror, his two sons, Henry II., and King John, all try to get the better of the pontiff? Shallow reasoning! The kings referred to represented only themselves; they did not represent the clergy, the people, or even the barons; their only supporters were the worldly courtiers who looked for favor, or the unmanly minority who preferred perfidy to persecution. But let us go a little into the details of this last controversy between King John and his clergy and the pontiff: (1) The pontiff claimed the right, and had the power, to choose whom he would for an English primate. (2) The pontiff claimed the right and had the power, to put England under an interdict for six years. (3) King John had to submit to the spiritual power, *because* the whole English nation believed in it. (4) The barons, when they insisted on "Magna Charta," insisted also on the spiritual *and* temporal liberties which the Church had enjoyed before the Conquest. (5) The barons and the people, like the bishops and the clerics, were all agreed as to the two main points in dispute—that the spiritual power was independent of the temporal power; and that the spiritual power must determine its own limits. Nor can any one justly accuse the spiritual power of having been tyrannical; for, its efforts were wholly in the direction of securing popular liberties, as had been the case in Henry the Second's quarrel with St. Thomas à Becket, or William Rufus's, or Henry the First's quarrel with St. Anselm.

V.

But *all* the English kings were not wilful ; the majority of them were faithful to their religion. Mr. Ingram—whose book has been briefly noticed—assumes that the pontiffs were often encroaching on the temporal power ; so that the temporal power had often to act on the defensive. In the same way, Lord Selborne seems to start with a sort of postulate, that the Holy See needed always to be kept in check. A good many English Catholic kings thought otherwise. We might do well, perhaps, to go back to pre-Norman times ; to the often disturbed but always loyal “Early English Church.” We have already said something about these times, but they are so instructive that we may do well to recur to them. Just before the Norman conquest—we may take instances as they occur to us—Catholic Wales set the world good examples. “Howel the Good” went to Rome to beg of the Pope a benediction on his new laws, ecclesiastical and civil. And, not far off, the Dukes of Brittany, about the same period, paid such obedience to the Head of God’s Church that their ambassadors put on record this declaration: “Our forefathers, from the hour they became Christians, were never guilty of apostasy; they lived up to Rome’s laws; and to the commands of the Roman See they never offered opposition.” The kings also of the Saxon Heptarchy were always loyal—the exceptions were so rare that they proved the rule. “I, Wiltred, an earthly king, . . . forbid to all kings our successors, and to ealdormen and all laymen, any lordship whatever over the churches.” And so, too, Kenulf, King of Mercia, wrote that he deemed “it fitting to incline the ear of his obedience, with all due humility, to the pontiff’s holy commands.” The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” says that, A.D. 780, “King Alfwold sent to Rome for a Pall and invested Eanbald as archbishop.” Moreover, a score of witnesses attest that the Pope’s writ ran in England and that the Saxon hierarchy executed it religiously. Ten kings of the Saxons crossed the Alps to pay homage to the Supreme Ruler of the Church: Cœadwalla, Ine, Offa, Cœnred, Offa, Siric, Burhed, Eardulf, Ethelwulf, and Canute the Dane. So also did the Queens Frythogithe and Ethelburga. King Cœadwalla went to Rome to be baptized. The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” notices that, A.D. 853, “King Ethelwulf sent his son Alfred to Rome, and Pope Leo consecrated him king and took him for his son at confirmation.” St. Edward, the last of the Saxon kings, being unable to go to Rome, begged a commutation of his vow from the Holy See, and the result was the historic Westminster Abbey. It should be mentioned that, A.D. 808, Eardwulf, King of Northumbria, being deposed, went to Rome to plead his cause with the Pope, and the

Pope sent his legate back with the restored king. Bede says that the Roman pilgrimage—a pious practice in early times, though accompanied by fearful hardships and risks—was accomplished by crowds, noble and ignoble ; and always, too, with the commendation of the king. It is told also in the “Chronicles” that for some reason, in 889, no Roman pilgrimage was made, “except that King Alfred sent two couriers with letters.” And while we are thinking of Saxon times, let it be mentioned that Kings Egbert and Oswy—so says Bede—“sent presents to the Apostolic Pope, and many presents of gold and silver.” So, too, King Kenulf, of Mercia, despatched to Rome an annual sum of 365 mancuses, to “support the poor and to supply oil for the numerous lamps in St. Peter’s.” Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, lavished gifts on the pontiffs, and sent four dishes of silver gilt for Pope Benedict III. ; and in his last will he ordered a continuance of his gifts, “in honor of St. Peter, specially to buy oil for the lights of the church.” The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” records that the alms of King Alfred were carried four times to Rome with much ceremony ; and William of Malmesbury writes that King Ethelwulf “went to Rome and there offered to St. Peter that tribute which England pays to this day ;” alluding to what we now call Peter’s Pence. King Canute, the Dane, was inexorable as to this Roman money, enjoining his subjects to pay “the Peter’s Pence, according to the ancient law,” the legislation of the last of the Saxon kings mentioning “half a mark” as the tax to be imposed by “Danish law,” payment to be received between the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul and the festival known as *Ad vincula*.

Now, all this was before the time of the Norman Conquest, when the “new customs,” so much approved by Anglican writers, were supposed to curb the Anglo-Roman communications. They did not curb them. The communications went on as in the old time. Besides, William the Conqueror was not so bad as he is painted. Collier, the Anglican historian, says that, “though he took care to make the most of his crown, and, it may be, strained his prerogative too far upon the Church in some cases, yet he never carried the point so far as to depose any Bishop.” Nor did the Conqueror ever interfere with the Church’s liturgy or doctrine, or with the exercise of her purely spiritual discipline ; he only “parted the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions,” ordering that “no cause relating to the discipline and government of the Church should be brought before a secular magistrate.” And so satisfied was the pontiff with William’s loyalty to the Holy See that he wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Indeed, the Conqueror appears to have alternated between admirable loyalty and worldly pride. His two sons leaned rather to the worldly pride. Still, even they

never disputed the Pope's supremacy. Had we space to run down the line of English kings we should find that, with but very few exceptions, they all admitted, and also acted upon, Catholic principles, their only temptation being to exaggerate their own sovereignty by claiming the right to define papal limitations.

VI.

There can be no better proof that "the temporal" and "the spiritual" were always kept distinct in Catholic times, and that the kings of the middle ages never presumed to touch the spiritual,—and so preserved the Catholic unity of belief,—than the clean sweep of Catholic doctrine which followed on the Reformation, which was the usurpation of the spiritual by the temporal. As long as the English kings obeyed the Pope in things spiritual (merely showing a little temper in their diplomacy), doctrine was never touched in the least particular; but the moment the Pontiff's primacy was repudiated, away went the whole body of Catholic truth. Mr. Ingram is our authority for this last fact, though he fails to draw the inference which should be patent. He says: "The whole outward aspect of religion was altered, as it were, *in a moment*, and the ancient practices, however innocent and inoffensive, were banned as superstitions. Customs and ceremonial consecrated by immemorial antiquity, and endeared by a thousand associations, were scornfully repressed. Contemporaneously with the changes in *discipline and doctrine*, England presented a scene of havoc and desecration, never before witnessed in a Christian country." The inevitable consequence of repudiating Christ's vicar! But we may at least gather this one satisfaction from the hideous consequences of the apostasy, that they *proved* that, in all the controversies of the Catholic kings, there was no idea of disobedience to the pontiff. We may use the word *proved*, because the argument stands thus, to put it in a perfectly legitimate form: Disobedience to the spiritual authority of the Pope generated the thousand sects of English Protestantism; just as it shivered into atoms the Church of England, leaving the Church *in* England perfectly united. But no schism, no sectarianism, had ever afflicted the Church in England so long as Catholics remained steadfast to the Holy See. Therefore (1) the consequence of disobedience was infinite division, and (2) conversely, the unity which prevailed throughout the middle ages *proved* the faithfulness of kings and people to Roman Catholicism.

The strange thing is that writers of marked ability should insist that "Protestant principles" were largely English all down the long centuries of the ages of faith while yet there was no division, no heresy (Wickliffe's riot, A.D. 1360, was not a heresy in

a doctrinal sense; we might call it an ecclesiastical socialism, and it came to nothing in the way of causing any schism); yet when they have to confess that Elizabethanism wrought chaos, they wholly dissociate the chaos from the disobedience. We have nothing to do with the private "views" of Protestant writers; but we are content to take our stand on this simple reasoning: The rejection of the papal supremacy begat chaos—chaos in all doctrine and all discipline; there was not a suspicion even of chaos in doctrine or in (spiritual) discipline during the whole of the ages preceding the Reformation; therefore we assume that there could not have been disobedience, in any sense that can be doctrinally called spiritual, in the conduct of kings and people during those ages.

VII.

The recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (August 2, 1892), in the appeal against the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury respecting the ritualism of the Anglican Bishop of Lincoln, is sufficient proof, if one were wanting, of the awful consequences of the rejection of the final spiritual authority of the Holy See. An Anglican bishop was accused by lay promoters of being "Roman Catholic" in certain excesses of his ritual. Barred by a statute of the Arches Court, the promoters had to carry their cause to the Judicial Committee, who referred them to the Archbishop's Court for a judgment. But that court had been obsolete for two centuries. It was, however, resuscitated for this occasion, and, when resuscitated, the Bishop of Lincoln disputed the jurisdiction of even this resuscitated court of the archbishop. He however subsequently accepted it, while the promoters appealed unsuccessfully against it. Thousands of pounds have been expended to obtain a judgment, and the judgment includes these two items: (1) The words of the hymn called *Agnus Dei* are "not likely to be abused to any kind of *idoltrous adoration* except by those who would make for themselves other opportunities for it"; and (2) It appears to be suggested that the eastward position at the Holy Table is significant of the act of the priest being a *sacrificial* one. The archbishop has pointed out that, *in his opinion*, this view is erroneous. Here, then, we have the "judicial" ultimate: (1) That there is no "idoltrous adoration" in the Church of England; (2) That Anglican priests do *not* perform a "sacrificial" act during any part of what is called the Communion Service; (3) That the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed his "opinion" that this is so.

Now contrast this particular strife, and its issue, with any strife, and its issue, during the Middle Ages. We have these three

grand distinctions : (1) A civil court tries a purely spiritual cause ; (2) A civil court decides against " idolatrous adoration " and against the " sacrificial " character of the Anglican priesthood ; (3) The archbishop is declared by this civil court to hold " opinions " which are in harmony with this judgment. Needless to say that no civil court in the Middle Ages, no civil court in the days of the early Church, would have even conceived the possibility of claiming such a jurisdiction, or of judicially affirming such heresies. While as to any Catholic archbishop holding " Protestant opinions," so flatly contradictory of the Catholic faith, well, from the time of Augustine to that of Warham, there was not one who could have even pictured such insanity. Imagine Archbishop Lanfranc (A.D. 1072) who wrote, " Verily, is it not ingrained in the consciences of all Christians that, in respect to St. Peter's successors no less than to himself, they must tremble at their threats, and yield joyful acclamation to their lofty graciousness ? " or Archbishop Anselm (A.D. 1092) who wrote, " It is certain that he who does not obey the the ordinances of the Roman Pontiffs is disobedient to the Apostle Peter ; " or St. Thomas of Canterbury (A.D. 1167) who wrote, " Who doubts that the Roman Church is the head of all the churches and the source of Christian doctrine ? " or Archbishop Peckham (A.D. 1281) who wrote, " The Apostolic See has power to set aside rights (*dominari jure*) and can do what is for the welfare of the Christian people " ; or Archbishop Winchelsea (A.D. 1296) who wrote to the Pope, " Robert kisses the sacred foot, with all promptitude to obey the papal mandates and precepts ; " or Archbishop Bradwardine (A.D. 1349) who wrote, " I will commit myself to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter ; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught ; " or Archbishop Warham (A.D. 1532) who wrote, " I neither intend to consent, nor with a clear conscience could consent, to any statute passed, or hereafter to be passed, in the Parliament, derogatory to the rights of the Holy See ; " imagine all, or any one, of these Catholic English primates assenting to the wild heresies of the " Judicial Committee," or to its usurpation of jurisdiction in spiritual matters ! And the testimonies of these archbishops (all English archbishops were the same) is proof positive that the faith of the nation was Catholic in every sense of the word ; and that therefore the faith of the English kings must have been in harmony with that faith—at least sufficiently to make them *respect* the national faith. When we read in such Anglican books as we have noticed, that " the accession of Edward I. put an end to the alliance between the papacy and the crown of England " ; or that, " At the time of Henry's accession, the Reformation was already in existence, and silently

working and fermenting in the minds of all men, popes, cardinals, and laymen" (two statements which are hazarded by Mr. Ingram) we can but think, "You wish these things to have been so, but you mistake the merely natural weaknesses of the human side of many Catholics for the interior faith and assured certainty of a whole nation. The "human side" of a good many Catholics has been always apparent. Human nature is not uprooted by the Catholic faith. Not all the Seven Sacraments can wholly obliterate the old leaven of the world, the flesh and the devil. But enough has been said to show that the entire English nation, kings, archbishops, clerics and laity, from the second to the sixteenth century of Christianity, "committed themselves," in the language of Archbishop Bradwardine, "to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught."

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.

No. 4. INGRATITUDE—MISFORTUNES—POSTHUMOUS HONORS.

THE return of Columbus from his fourth and last expedition to Spain, prostrated with disease, bending under advanced age, poor, neglected and unnoticed, and even hounded down in such extreme misfortunes by his enemies, is one of the saddest pictures in history. One of his vessels, the one he occupied, was disabled soon after leaving port, and had to be sent back to San Domingo, while he and his son and immediate followers had to go on the other ship, which was commanded by his brother Bartholomew. Other serious accidents, and repeated storms of severest violence, made the voyage an exhausting one, while he was himself prostrated on his bed by an accumulation of his old complaints. Rejecting every consideration in favor of stopping at the Azores for repairs, he hastened forward through storms and accidents, tempest tossed and almost in a dying state, until he reached Spain, San Lucar, and then Seville. The man who had given a New World to Spain had no home in Spain, and was forced to put up at an humble inn. Gladly would he have journeyed on to Medino del Campo, where the court then resided, but his sufferings made him helpless and unable to move. It happened that the friends he had in Seville were all absent; even the good and learned Gaspard Gorricio had then left his monastery. The Bureau of the Indies had grown to be an extensive admiralty administration, with many officials and employes, all under the presidency of Fonseca, his enemy. In fact he was in the city of his enemies. It is humbling to our humanity to relate that in such a direful extremity his enemies did not allow him repose or relief. Though aware of their renewed machinations, and that the rebels, who had attempted his life, were at large, protected and even received at court, he even now from his scanty means relieved the wants of the poor sailors whom he had brought back from Hispaniola, amongst whom were several of the rebels. He also earnestly and repeatedly commended to the court the payment of their dues. From his bed, he wrote an account of all his affairs to the sovereigns. The hands that had been fettered, and that now could not move without excruciating pain, penned letters of clearest statement to the Spanish sovereigns.

But the mental agonies of the venerable Admiral exceeded all. Scarcely had his wounded heart ceased to bleed at the death of

his good and generous friend at court, Doña Juana de la Torre, than he realized the perilous condition of another, and his best, friend, the gentle and peerless Isabella. During his absence she had raised his son, Don Diego, to the rank and emoluments of the body guard, had issued letters of naturalization to his brother Diego, who, having joined the priesthood, was now endowed with a benefice; she had written twice to Ovando to take good care of the interests of the admiral, and she had raised his faithful follower and deliverer, Diego Mendez, to the ranks of the nobility. His object in hastening home amidst storms and accidents was that he might see the queen. Now that he had come, he could not see her. It is said that she exacted from Ferdinand, on her death bed, a promise to recall Ovando, who had almost exterminated the Indians of Hispaniola, and the restoration of Columbus to his vice-regal administration; promises which he never fulfilled. What must have been his agony, when shortly after November 26, 1504, he received the tidings of the death on that day, of Isabella! From his bed of torture he penned the following instructions to his son, showing not only his love and veneration for the good and true departed queen, but also his loyalty to the perfidious king: "A memorial for thee, my dear son Diego, of what is at present to be done. The principal thing is to commend affectionately, and with great devotion, the soul of the Queen, our sovereign, to God. Her life was always Catholic and holy, and prompt to all things in His holy service; for this reason we may rest assured that she is received into His glory, beyond the cares of this rough and weary world. The next thing is to watch and labor in all matters for the service of our sovereign the king, and to endeavor to alleviate his grief. His majesty is the head of Christendom. Remember the adage that when the head suffers all the members suffer. Therefore all good Christians should pray for his health and long life; and we, who are in his employ, ought more than others to do this with all study and diligence." It is no wonder, then, that it was remarked that the transcendent services of the subject could never inspire the sovereign with gratitude, or that the greatest ingratitude of the sovereign could make the subject cease to be loyal. At this distant day we cannot comprehend the sentiments of Columbus and of Isabella towards each other. That she regarded him as a friend, a Christian of highest type, the mirror of her own virtues, a model of modesty, simplicity, artlessness, sanctity and loyalty, and admired his grandeur of character and sublimity of genius, is too well known. In her he saw a model of purity, constancy and fidelity, the grace of religion, the poetry of humanity, the soul of sympathy, the type of honor, and the human perfection of religion. The Count de Lorgues says,

that at her death, Columbus experienced a lifelessness of heart, the mute desolation of the tomb, an unutterable grief, and an intense increase of his physical sufferings.

It is not with the same results that we come now to speak of the relations of Columbus with King Ferdinand. On his arrival at Seville, he wrote to the court to announce his return and his readiness to await the royal orders, and on receipt of the letter Ferdinand spoke to the Admiral's son Diego the most flattering things of his father, but no answer was sent to the letter. A memorial accompanying the letter received no notice, though it contained important information and recommendations on the administration of Hispaniola. Twice afterwards he wrote to the king, but he received no answer. At his repeated request his son made every effort to obtain an answer, but failed of success. While Ferdinand made no reply to the letters of Columbus, the Sovereign Pontiff, of his own motion, wrote to the Admiral to request information of his discoveries in the Indies, and received in reply an elaborate report. While no notice was taken by Ferdinand of the protest of the viceroy of the Indies against the pretentious plan of himself, Ovando and Fonseca, for the erection of an Episcopal hierarchy in Hispaniola, where no Indians scarcely, either pagan or Christian, were left alive, the Holy See hearkened to the message of Columbus and to the embassy of his brother Bartholomew; and, even after the king had named the candidates for episcopal and archiepiscopal honors, and the Pope had approved from his information, it was the protest of Columbus that arrested the vain proceedings and the forwarding of the bulls. Ovando cared not for the flock, for flock there was none, provided he embellished his administration with the grandeur of the hierarchy. It was a mockery of zeal and religion. The voice of the man who had discovered America, had more power at Rome, than the united voices of Ovando, Fonseca, the Spanish ambassador, and Ferdinand, the king. In this instance Columbus exerted more power on his death bed than Ferdinand on his throne. Rome is ever just.

While the discoverer of America was thus drinking the bitter chalice of sorrow, disappointment, neglect, ingratitude and disease, and while the shadows of death were clustering around his bed of illness, another incident took place at Seville, which is replete with intense interest. Columbus received a visit from Americus Vesputius. In the July number of the REVIEW, I saw a brief account of the manner, in which the name of America, in honor of Americus, had been conferred upon the New World, instead of the name of Columbia, in honor of Columbus. Though Las Casas seems to have entertained a doubt as to the innocence of Ameri-

cus in this matter, it seems now to be well settled that this unfortunate misnomer of the New World was not brought about by any design or contrivance of Americus. His relations with Columbus were always friendly, and on this occasion he proffered his kind offices to the Admiral at court, to which he had been invited by King Ferdinand. Columbus had essayed in vain to obtain the slightest justice from the king; his offices and titles were either taken away or ignored, and his very income and revenues were withheld. While immense sums were due to Columbus, he was suffering the pangs of poverty and want. He was only too glad to avail himself of the kind offers of Americus at court; and gave him a letter of introduction and commendation to his son, Diego. Columbus spoke of Americus as "a very good man." It is sad, however, to relate that the intercession of Americus Vesputius at the court of Ferdinand, brought no relief to Columbus. Mr. Irving well and sympathetically describes the situation thus: "A little delay, a little more disappointment, and a little more infliction of ingratitude, and his loyal and generous heart would cease to beat; he should then be delivered from the just claims of a well-tried servant, who, in ceasing to be useful, was considered by him to have become importunate."

It was an error of the Count de Lorgues to suppose that the conduct of Americus towards Columbus was not blameless, and that their relations were not the best. On the contrary, they entertained a high regard for each other. It is quite probable, on historical data, that Americus took part in fitting out the second voyage of Columbus. They were certainly acquainted with each other in the summer of 1493, and probably sooner. Mr. Fiske says, "the relations between the two seem always to have been most cordial, and after the Admiral's death his sons seem to have continued to hold the Florentine navigator in high esteem. In the midst of our disappointment at the misnomer of our country, it is a source of honorable pride, at least, that it was not named after a selfish and intriguing intruder, but rather after a man of honor, truth, loyalty and renown. But the honor, on the contrary, was justly due to Columbus and Columbia should have been the name of the New World.

We have mentioned, as among the wrongs sustained by Columbus, that the New World he discovered was not named in his honor. We have already explained briefly how this was brought about. But it was a wrong which was not inflicted until after his death. It is a wrong to his name and fame; a posthumous injustice. It seems that the term *mundus novus*, as used in the letters of Americus applied only to Brazil, and so, too, the name of America, when first used, applied only to Brazil. The first map

on which appeared the name of America was prepared and annotated by the eminent old master in art, Leonardo da Vinci, the celebrated painter of the Last Supper, and was made about the year 1514, or eight years after the death of Columbus. It applied only to South America, or Brazil. The first map on which the name was applied to both continents was made in 1541, by Mercator, thirty-five years after the death of Columbus and twenty-nine years after the death of Americus. Mercator was born in the very year in which Americus died, 1512.

Much learned speculation has been expended on the simple question of the name of the New World. Not the least queer and far-fetched theory on the subject is that of Professor Jules Marcon, that the name, after all, was not derived from Americus Vesputius, but rather from a mountainous range in Nicaragua, which was called by the Indians *Amerrique*, or Americ, and the professor supposes that Columbus must have heard of these mountains on his fourth voyage; but he does not see that the name would have been more appropriately applied to Nicaragua. Mr. Fiske mentions what he calls an elfish coincidence that the original America received its name, Brazil, from its principal dye-wood, while the ports of Asia visited by Marco Polo and de Garner received its name of India from its principal dye-wood, that the traveller Pegolotti saw in Sumatra a kind of Brazil-wood, which was called Ameri, and still another, and better one, which was called Columbino. But the suggestions of other and subsequent names for our continent is still more singular. One of the names suggested was *Cabotia*, in honor of the discoverer of our own country, John Cabot, while others suggested *Sebastiana*, by which the honor would be given to the son, Sebastian Cabot, in preference to the father. *Alleghenia* has also been suggested, as if the Tellegwi or Cherokee Indians were entitled to the distinction, while the Iroquois were complimented by the suggestion of the name of *Ganowania* or *Hodunosannia*, or country of the Long House, a name applied to the Five Nations residing in the Valley of the Mohawk. Mr. Fiske also mentions quaintly that in the seventeenth century Pizarro, of Orellano, who disliked the name of America, not because it was an injustice to Columbus, but because it was not sufficiently aristocratic, proposed the name of *Fer-Isabelica*, in honor of Ferdinand and Isabella, and he then asks, "Gentle reader, how would you like to be a Fer-Isabelican?" Another Spaniard proposed to name our continents in honor of the Emperor Charles V., *Orbis Carolinus*. And late in the sixteenth century a Portuguese author of learning suggested for the New World the name of Golden India, as distinguished from Aromatic India. But all changes of name are now impossible,

for the name of America has come to stay. While Ferdinand Columbus (the son of the Admiral, and his historian), heard the name of America applied to the New World, and took no exception, because he supposed that South America or Brazil, was intended, Bishop Las Casas grew indignant that a Florentine should give his name to a new world discovered by Spain, and that it should have been called America instead of Columbia. To one of such lively sensibilities as Christopher Columbus, the bestowal of his own name upon the world which he had discovered would have been esteemed as the highest honor, and one to which he would have considered himself absolutely entitled. The consensus of opinion is certainly in favor of such a claim.

The candle of life was fast wasting away; sickness, disease, disappointment, ingratitude and hope deferred had brought the great discoverer to the verge of death. His letters and appeals to an ungrateful sovereign remained unanswered. The sanguine spirit of Columbus suggested to him to go to court, at every hazard, and plead his cause in person. At his request, his son Diego applied to the king and obtained permission for him to travel to Valladolid, where the court was then held, on a mule, as he was unable, from weakness to ride a horse, and a municipal law interdicted the use of mules in saddle and bridle. On February 23d the permission was given, but when it came Columbus was too weak to avail himself of it. Such was his exhausted condition that he could not use his limbs, and yet he relaxed no part of the strictest observance of the austerities of Lent, and on his bed of pain and sorrow he followed with exactness the austere rule and discipline of the Franciscans. In May, the fine weather, with Dr. Bartholomew's aid, enabled him to mount his mule and commence his journey. Did the ungrateful king suggest this journey, that he might be done with him? But he reached Segovia, greatly prostrated, where the court was held, after enduring intense sufferings and consequent delay at Salamanca.

King Ferdinand was an exceedingly polite man; he could even venture on being gracious, and he could skilfully express his satisfaction and pleasure at seeing an old and faithful servant. While omitting to call him by his true and legal title of viceroy, or to recognize his rank, his patience at the Admiral's recital of his perilous voyage, and still more of the discovery of the rich gold mines of Veragua, was most regal. The long and detailed account of the Admiral's shipwreck at Jamaica, his abandonment by Ovando, the Governor of Hispaniola, the revolt of the Porras brothers, the treatment he had received at San Domingo, did not in the least fatigue the king. On the contrary, he gave ample and polite expression to the deep interest he felt in the

Admiral and to the gratitude of the crown for his services. But withal, the poor Admiral found that the king managed to terminate the interview while seeming to prolong it. No promise of justice or decision as to the Admiral's status was made. Columbus understood the king well; yet his sanguine temperament led him again after a few days to the palace, where he found effusive politeness, as well as royal circumspection and reserve. The Admiral was bereft of every opportunity for asking any question calling for a direct answer. But the king spoke abundantly and sympathetically of the old man's rheumatism and gout, gave wholesome advice as to the care he should take of himself, and even mentioned the medicines suitable for his disease. Yet the Admiral again found himself terminating the interview in spite of his wish to the contrary; the king had saluted him *a Dios*. Such practices would now be clever in a modern politician after the election. Let us recall the reception Columbus received at Barcelona; but that was before the election!

Columbus next addressed a letter to the king in which he plainly and directly reminded him of former promises, and expressed a preference for good deeds rather than for good wishes or fine words. The wily king now adopted the silencing course of promising anything—for how then could the Admiral doubt his word!—and he diplomatically proposed to refer the numerous and complex matters in question to arbitration. The Admiral accepted the proposal and named the new Archbishop of Seville, Don Diego de Deza, and to this the king assented; but, from some cause or other, this was the last heard of arbitration. The poor Admiral next proposed to leave the whole matter to the king himself, that thus he might avoid the delays of litigation, and from the king's bounty and justice finally receive what was due to him; then the spent servant could retire to obscurity and in peace prepare for death. The answer of the perfidious king to this appeal was the most heartless of all, for he assured the Admiral that the king could not dispense with his services, but would accord him all his dues, that Spain owed to him the Indies, and that not only should he have all that was due to him, but that the crown would recompense him most generously. With such assurances from his king the Admiral could but be silent. Further insistence would be an insult to the crown. Such was his own integrity and truth that he even now seemed to trust his most perfidious enemy. But as time wore away, and no promises were fulfilled, and no relief came, Columbus made an appeal to the Junta de Descaigos, a tribunal to watch over the execution of the royal intentions and testamentary dispositions. The Junta took the matter in hand, but its delays were insufferable, and the proceedings were paralyzed. Again at his de-

mand the investigation was resumed, but only resulted in delays. The members of the Junta were, of course, divided. To their honor be it said, that Cardinal Ximenes and the Archbishop of Seville pronounced their opinion in favor of the Admiral, and they were supported by every conscientious member of the body. But the king's hand was felt, though not seen; and around him were ranged a majority consisting of courtiers and relatives of the king, who all united in the opinion that the obligations assumed by the crown in and by the convention of April, 1492, with Columbus, could not be fulfilled, because they exceeded the value of the services rendered, and because it would be impolitic and unwise for any sovereign to make one of his subjects so powerful, especially a foreigner. But still the Junta made no decision. A majority stood on the side of injustice, but shrank from formulating it in a decision. Ferdinand's hand was seen throughout.

Columbus's poverty was so great that he was unable to maintain his stay in Segovia. Imagine the mockery of subjecting such a man to the forms, ceremonies and expenses of attendance on a punctilious court. His bodily sufferings became greatly increased by the agonies of his mind. He was forced to go to Valladolid, where it was cheaper to live. Here the court tarried a very short time. The tortures of his disease were a living death. Ferdinand coolly watched his victim,—his strength was gone, his resources were exhausted. Could the Admiral refuse a compromise in such straits as these? Availing himself of the Admiral's dire misfortunes, Ferdinand had the meanness to propose to him a release of all his privileges and the acceptance in lieu thereof of an estate or demesne in Castile, the fief of Carrion de los Condes, together with a pension from the king's treasury. At this blow the old spirit of the Admiral arose in his breast, and he rejected the unworthy offer with disdain. This proud answer of a subject to a king was given by the occupant of a narrow little room in the inn at Valladolid; and on the walls of that room were then hanging the fetters in which the discoverer of the New World had been sent back to Spain. The hard terms proposed by Ferdinand to Columbus, and worse ones, have since been wrenched from his family and successors; all his hereditary titles, offices and emoluments have since been surrendered in exchange for the barren Dukedom of Veragua. But retributive justice has kept pace with spoliation; the vast empires which Columbus gave to Spain have passed from her grasp; the island of Cuba is the only remnant of the New World his genius and generosity bestowed.

The elevated and saintly character of Columbus is shown throughout these unworthy proceedings of his king and of the whole Spanish administration. It has already been remarked that

no amount of royal ingratitude could diminish his loyalty. His chastened soul preserved silence under such wrongs; wrongs the more consuming because they were inflicted by a king upon a loyal subject. On the other hand, and in contrast with all this, the conduct of Columbus was otherwise marked by profound courtesy, consideration and sagacity. When he sent his report to Rome, he sent a copy of it to his open enemy, Fonseca. When the latter was promoted to the See of Palencia, Columbus instructed his son to make his homage to the new bishop, saying, "If the Bishop of Palencia has arrived, or when he arrives, tell him how rejoiced I am at his advancement, and if I come to the court I will stay with His Grace, will he nill he; and we must renew our former brotherly ties; and he cannot withdraw from it, for my services will make it so." And now again, when the Infanta of Spain, Queen Juana, and her husband, Archduke Philip, arrived from Flanders to take possession of the throne of Castile, which she inherited on the death of her mother, Isabella, Columbus, with an honorable regard for others, sent his faithful brother Bartholomew to Laredo to unite with King Ferdinand in receiving them, and to present to the royal daughter the homage which he had always paid to the mother. He would have gone in person but for a renewal of his cruel tortures. Bartholomew discharged his mission with manly dignity, and added the expression of a hope that the new queen might restore him to the honors and estates of which he was now so unjustly deprived. But under the new Queen of Castile the overpowering and ever-vigilant influence of Ferdinand prevented the bestowal of justice on this much-abused and greatly wronged and illustrious subject. In two years, Ferdinand succeeded to the throne of Castile on the death of Juana, as her heir.

The conduct of Ferdinand towards Columbus has met with universal condemnation. The learned publicist, Tarducci, while seeing some danger to the Spanish crown in the bestowal of immense powers and revenues upon a subject, says that "it was not by breach of faith, perjury and blackest ingratitude that he (Ferdinand) ought to have secured the safety of his crown." The Count de Lorgues details with righteous indignation, and with generous sympathy for the wronged one, the pecuniary embarrassments of Columbus bordering on absolute want, and his fruitless efforts to regain his titles, government and revenues for himself or for his son and successors; and then adds: "Ferdinand could not in fact be moved." Father Knight writes as follows: "Ferdinand was unworthy of the loyal service of Columbus, utterly unworthy of the faithful love of the saintly Isabella. In Isabella's grave lay buried the earthly hopes of her great Admiral.

From her death to his own, eighteen months later, he was working hard, for his son's sake, to obtain from the ungrateful king his money overdue and his privileges confirmed upon oath again and again. Ferdinand saw that his troublesome suit would soon be stilled in death, and so he put him off with fair words and waited for the end."

Mr. Prescott has expressed his opinion of Ferdinand's treatment of Columbus in these unmistakable terms: "But whatever reason may have operated to postpone Columbus's restoration to power, it was the grossest injustice to withhold from him the revenues secured by the original contract with the crown. According to his own statement, he was so far from receiving his share of the remittances made by Ovando, that he was obliged to borrow money, and had actually incurred a heavy debt for his necessary expenses. The truth was, that as the resources of the new countries began to develop themselves more abundantly, Ferdinand felt greater reluctance to comply with the letter of the original capitulation; he now considered the compensation as too vast and altogether disproportioned to the services of any subject; and at length was so ungenerous as to propose that the Admiral should relinquish his claims in consideration of other estates and dignities to be assigned him in Castile. It argued less knowledge of character than the king usually showed that he should have thought the man, who had broken off all negotiations on the threshold of a dubious enterprise rather than abate one tittle of his demands, would consent to such abatement when the success of that enterprise was so gloriously established." Even Justin Winsor, the librarian of Harvard, who had some reputation as an historian before he wrote his "Life of Columbus," says: "The change bringing him in the presence of his royal master only made his mortification more poignant. His personal suit to the king was quite as ineffectual as his letters had been. The sovereign was outwardly beneficent and inwardly uncompliant. The Admiral's recitals respecting his last voyage, both of promised wealth and saddened toil, made little impression. He evaded the point in his talk with bland countenance, and did nothing in his acts beyond referring the question anew to a body of counsellors convened to determine the fulfilment of the queen's will. They did nothing quite as easily as the king. Las Casas tells us that the king was only restrained by motives of outward decency from a public rejection of all the binding obligations towards the Admiral, into which he had entered jointly with the queen." Mr. Fiske writes of this sad part of the saddest of lives: "The death of the queen deprived Columbus of the only protector who could stand between him and Fonseca"; he might have added—and between him and King Ferdinand.

"The reimbursement for the wrongs which he had suffered at that man's hands" (and at Ferdinand's) was never made. The last eighteen months of the Admiral's life were spent in sickness and poverty. Accumulated hardships and disappointment had broken him down, and he died." Mr. Irving says in various places: "These petitions were treated by Ferdinand with his usual professions and evasions." . . . "The cold and calculating Ferdinand beheld this illustrious man sinking under infirmity of body, heightened by that deferred hope which 'maketh the heart sick.'" The great and good Las Casas wrote: "The more applications were made to him, the more favorably did he reply; but still he delayed, hoping to exhaust their patience." Our "American Cyclopædia" says: "He lay sick some months at Seville, and recovered only to have his claims finally rejected by the king, Queen Isabella being now dead. An old man, broken in body, although in full possession of his mental faculties" (Justin Winsor makes him a lunatic), "having in his own words 'no place to repair to except an inn, and often with nothing to pay for his sustenance,' the discoverer of the New World died."

Such was the persistent hatred with which Columbus was pursued, even to his grave, by enemies whom he had never injured, that he thought as a last resource he would withdraw from their sight, and altogether from public sight. His health, already desperate, received another severe blow from his wearisome journeys, as he dragged himself about in pursuit of the court and of what was quite a different thing—justice. At Valladolid he was again forced to his bed, and the reaction from his recent struggles with the king left his body and mind utterly prostrated; and hope was gone. As a peace-offering to his enemies, since his own life was spent, and the thought of his children and family pressed upon his heart, he now addressed a last and powerful appeal to the king, proposing to surrender all his rights and privileges into his hands, and only asking that his son and successor, Diego, might be appointed to the government of which he had been deprived. In his petition to the king, Columbus wrote: "It is a matter which concerns my honor. Your Majesty may do as you think proper with all the rest; give or take, as may appear for your advantage, and I shall be satisfied. I believe that the worry caused by the delay of my suit is the main cause of my ill-health." This was the last appeal which the discoverer of the New World made to Ferdinand, to whom he had given that world; and as long as these repeated appeals to his ungrateful king continued, his sanguine mind gave birth and nourishment to new hopes, and indulged in projects of new enterprises for the good of mankind and for the exaltation of religion. This last appeal met with no better result than all pre-

ceding ones. Columbus was left to die. His sad condition at this moment, which makes an appalling contrast with his triumph at Barcelona in 1493, is vividly described by Francesco Tarducci: "Meanwhile the misfortunes of Columbus were nearing their end. The momentary fire which for a brief space revived him was extinguished. The Adelantado had hardly left him (to greet the Infanta Juana) when nature asserted her claims, and age and suffering weighed heavier than before on his enfeebled body. His illness grew daily more alarming, and soon there was no doubt of the mortal result that it would soon produce. On the 19th of May the Admiral himself perceived his hour approaching, and, calm and tranquil with the faith and resignation of the righteous, he prepared for the great passage. But before he attained this calm resignation, how many thoughts must have crowded his mind in that last struggle between life and death, and all full of inexpressible grief! The long years spent in running from one place to another to beg audience of kings, ministers and grandees of the kingdom; the mockery and scorn with which he was received and repelled on every side; the struggles he underwent in support of his ideas; the fatigues and perils and distress he suffered in carrying them out; and the grandeur of his achievements and the enthusiasm he had aroused on every side. And now, after enriching Spain with so many regions and such treasures as no human tongue ever told of; after changing, by his discoveries, the face of the known world, doubling the known space of the globe, he was now groaning in abandonment and contempt in a wretched lodging-house, and compelled to beg for a loan of money to buy a cot to die on. And those who had ridiculed his undertaking were triumphing in wealth and ease, in power and honor."

Columbus calmly, bravely and reverently prepared to meet the fate awaiting him in common with all men. Affection and a sense of justice led his magnanimous soul to give a studious and deliberate attention to the disposition he should make of his temporal interests. These interests were now denied and were nothing in possession; but in right and good title they were immense, and were proportioned to, and would increase with, the gradual development of the western empire he had given to Spain. His relations with his family were of the most gentle and amiable nature. In his years of poverty and struggle he had always remembered his impoverished father, assisting him from his own scanty purse, and in the midst of every business pressure visiting and consoling him. His mother was dead. His two sons were devoted and loyal beyond example, and his brothers were models of fraternal love and service. He had previously made his will, about the

year 1497 or 1498, between his second and third voyages, in which he created an entail of his estates in his family. Fully comprehending and appreciating the grandeur and extent of his achievement, he, from the beginning, and before his terms were accepted, regarded the dignity and state which he had to maintain as Admiral, Viceroy and Governor as requiring a large revenue and princely surroundings; and withal, he munificently provided for the Columbian Crusade which was to restore the Holy Sepulchre to Christendom, for the poor members of his family, and for the poor of his native city of Genoa. His will has been justly regarded as reflecting the character and inward self of Columbus, so that a brief synopsis of its contents will serve an important purpose. After a profession of faith in the Holy Trinity, who inspired him with the idea of discovering the New World, and reciting his discovery and the stipulations by which he was to receive a tenth and an eighth parts of the revenues therefrom, he creates an entailed estate in the one-eighth in his elder son Diego and his descendants, and, on failure thereof, to his second son Fernando, then, again on failure of descendants male, to his brother Bartholomew, and finally to the nearest relative of legitimate birth bearing the name of Columbus. Females were excluded from the succession until failure of the male line. Ample provision was made for his son Fernando, and for his brothers Bartholomew and Diego, independently of their possible succession to the entail; for the poor members of his family, and a dower for poor girls in the Columbus family; a member of the family and bearing his name should be honorably maintained in Genoa, his native city. He then provides a fund for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre and City of Jerusalem for Christendom; for his heirs ever maintaining a true loyalty to the Spanish Crown; for the upholding of the prosperity and honor of the Republic of Genoa; for building a Church in honor of Mary of the Immaculate Conception in Hispaniola; and for providing theologians for the Indians and for their conversion to Christianity. Columbus wrote another will, in 1502, but it never came to light, and no doubt conformed to the will of 1497 or 1498. But now in August 25, 1505, he sent to a notary and made a codicil by which he confirmed the entail of his estates made in the will of 1497 or 1498, and its other chief provisions, and made provisions for his second wife Beatrice Enriquez. The most noticeable feature in this codicil is the change of the Admiral's language in regard to King Ferdinand; for in the former will he had greatly eulogized the generosity of the king and queen in taking up the great enterprise of his discovery; but now he states in his codicil that he "had made them a present of the Indies as a thing of his own." A remarkable feature in this

codicil is that wherein Columbus thus solemnly rejects and repudiates the territorial line established by treaty between Spain and Portugal, and adheres to the line of demarkation established by the Pope. In this he manifested a sagacity far superior to that of the wily Ferdinand; a sagacity, which, if it had been followed by Spain, would have saved to her the immense empire of Brazil. It would probably, also, have prevented the name of Americus from being given to the New World instead of that of Columbus. With great delicacy of thought and memory, after signing the codicil, he wrote in his own handwriting the names of several persons who had given him some little aid at various times; and now his son was directed to see them all paid, amongst them a poor Jew, whose name he did not remember, but whose address he gave as one living near the Jewry Gate in Lisbon.

The many unjust charges which have been made against Columbus must be classed among the instances of ingratitude he suffered, and the wrongs and misfortunes of his life and of his posthumous fame. One of the first charges in point of time and virulence was the accusation that he was selfish, grasping and avaricious. This unworthy charge is fully refuted by the will, which I have just mentioned. No man could be selfish who had thus been so generous and so just to others. No man could be grasping who had thus been so free and openhanded in disposing of his means. No man could be avaricious who showed such utter disregard for the possession or hoarding of wealth. This charge has been specially applied to the alleged exorbitancy of the terms which he insisted on in his negotiations with the Spanish sovereigns. Had these terms been exorbitant, the grasping and avaricious Ferdinand never would have conceded them. Services, like every other thing of value, have their recompense, have to be estimated by the risk run, by the great gain expected, and by the result, the competition and the actual acceptance. Had those of Columbus been overestimated by him, would the king of Portugal have sent for him to return to Portugal and receive from him the concession of the same recompense? Would the king of England have sent him a favorable message by his brother Bartholomew? Would the king of France have done the same? There is no pretext that the services eventuated at a lower value than he had placed upon them; on the contrary the empires acquired by Spain and their revenues exceeded all the calculations, and the revenues increased with every succeeding year. By ordinary standards, the compensation should have been increased, as the value of the discovery advanced. In fact King Ferdinand found that the compensation, inasmuch as it grew with the percentage of the vast increase of the importance, vastness, riches and revenues from the New World,

would become too excessive for a subject to possess or a monarch to give. It was impossible then for the compensation to become excessive on the value of the services. There was a fixed ratio between the two.

In regard to the charge that Columbus was avaricious and mercenary in his negotiations with the Spanish sovereigns, since Mr. Justin Winsor has so lately revived the charge with increased virulence, I will quote the juster and more historical view of Mr. Washington Irving, who was far more competent than Mr. Winsor to pass upon the merits of Columbus. Mr. Irving says: "It has been said that mercenary views mingled with the ambition of Columbus, and that his stipulations with the Spanish Court were selfish and avaricious. The charge is inconsiderate and unjust. He aimed at dignity and wealth in the same lofty spirit in which he sought renown; they were to be part and parcel of his achievement, and palpable evidence of its success; they were to arise from the territories he should discover, and be commensurate in importance, no condition could be more just. He asked nothing of the sovereigns but a command of the countries he hoped to give them, and a share of the profits to support the dignity of his commands. If there should be no country discovered, his stipulated viceroyalty would be of no avail; and if no revenues should be produced, his labor and peril would produce no gain. If his command and revenues ultimately proved magnificent, it was from the magnificence of the regions he had attached to the Castilian crown. What monarch would not rejoice to gain such empires on such conditions? But he did not risk merely a loss of labor, and a disappointment of ambition in the enterprise; on his motives being questioned, he voluntarily undertook and with the assistance of his co-adjutors, actually defrayed, one-eighth of the whole charges of the first expedition." Las Casas, a contemporary and personal acquaintance and friend of Columbus, commends him for insisting on terms, which exhibited his "great constancy and loftiness of soul." Mr. John Fiske, of Cambridge, more just and intelligent than his neighbor, Mr. Justin Winsor, of Harvard, calls the latter a "querulous critic," and observes that the terms demanded were intended for no selfish purpose, but rather to enable Columbus to undertake "another grand scheme of his own," "to deliver Jerusalem from the miscreant followers of Mahomet, the enlargement of the bounds of Christendom and the achieving of triumphs of untold magnificence for its banners." How much more creditable to the historian is this large and magnanimous view, than that of Mr. Justin Winsor, who makes himself a driveller in struggling to make one of Columbus.

Among the charges against Columbus, which show the ingrati-

tude he had to bear, and the misfortunes of his exalted station, was the blended accusation that he was incompetent for command or administration, and cruel and tyrannical in his viceregal government of Hispaniola. So far from being cruel to the natives, it is well known that he was, from the beginning, their true and gentle friend, and, among a thousand instances I could cite, I will mention only two—his encountering the animosity of Pinzon, who had deserted the expedition, by liberating the Indians he had taken on his ships as slaves to be sold in Spain; his incurring the hatred of Father Boil, for defending the good and faithful cacique, Guacamagari, against the suspicions and condemnations of the Vicar-Apostolic, and taking the chief to his friendship when Father Boil would have handed him over to punishment. His alleged cruelty to Spaniards was certainly not manifested in pardoning the rebel Roldan, and taking him again into his service; nor in sharing with the Spanish rebels in his exile, on the island of Jamaica, the sparse supplies he received from Aguado, nor in taking them back to Spain at his own expense, sharing his last pittance of cash with them at Seville, and urging the payment of their dues by the government while he himself was in need, and was deprived of his revenues and property. Compared with the atrocities practised in Hispaniola, under Bobadilla and Aguado, the administration of Columbus was not only merciful, but was, in fact, most lenient. It was only when Spaniards became the meanest miscreants, or Indians threatened the existence of the Spanish rule in America, that he asserted his authority, and used his power of punishment; but even then, it was always tempered with mercy. The opinions of two historians, writing four hundred years apart, and under different circumstances—one under the Spanish monarchy, and the other under our own free government and institutions—are worthy of our acquiescence and concurrence. These opinions, on the double charge of incompetency of administration and tyrannical conduct, are well set forth in the following passage from Mr. Fiske, who gives also the opinion of Bishop Las Casas: "When Margarite and Boyle were once within reach of Fonseca, we need not wonder that mischief was soon brewing. It was unfortunate for Columbus that his work of exploration was hampered by the necessity of founding a colony and governing a parcel of unruly men let loose in the wilderness, far away from the restraints of civilized society. Such work required undivided attention and extraordinary talent for command. It does not appear that Columbus was lacking in such talent. On the contrary, both he and his brother, Bartholomew, seem to have possessed it in a high degree. But the situation was desperately bad, when the spirit of mutiny was fomented by deadly enemies at court. I do

not find adequate justification of the charges of tyranny brought against Columbus. The veracity and fairness of the history of Las Casas are beyond question; in his divinely beautiful spirit one sees now and then a trace of tenderness even for Fonseca, whose conduct towards him was always as mean and malignant as towards Columbus. One gets from Las Casas the impression that the Admiral's high temper was usually kept under firm control, and that he showed far less severity than most men would have done under similar provocation. Bartholomew was made of sterner stuff, but his whole career presents no instance of wanton cruelty; towards both white men and Indians his conduct was distinguished by clemency and moderation. Under the government of these brothers a few scoundrels were hanged at Hispaniola—many more ought to have been."

Columbus has been accused of being the first to introduce slavery into America. This is a serious charge, and should be met in the spirit of candor and truth. And at the outset we must premise, that the views and practices in relation to slavery which prevailed, or were tolerated, among Christian nations at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, are not the views and practices of Christian nations of the present day. The Catholic Church has always been the greatest of the advocates of liberty, and the most beneficent of emancipators. Slavery was tolerated when she came into existence; and while she has never lost her heaven-inspired wisdom, she has refrained from the fanatical pursuit of a great object, and has not waged war on what the civil law of the State regarded as vested rights. It is undeniable that for the eighteen hundred years of her existence she has opposed slavery, and now, at the close of the nineteenth century, her successive victories in the cause of human liberty have left her free to wage the warfare against the African slave-trade—the subjection into slavery of new slaves—and in this struggle she is the leading spirit. In an article in the number of this REVIEW for January, 1890, the present writer, in an article entitled "The New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century," has detailed the splendid labors of Cardinal Lavigerie, the great bishop of Africa, and of Pope Leo XIII., against slavery and the slave-trade. Whatever may have been the practice of nations at the period in question, they lend no countenance to slavery or to the slave-trade, or to the subjugation of human beings to slavery, for us, or for our day, or for our country. Las Casas, the great Catholic bishop and Liberator of that day, was, himself, at first a slave-owner, by gift of his father, as was also the present writer a slaveholder by inheritance in his early life. Las Casas, when a youth, received from his father the gift of one of the Indian slaves sent over

to Spain by Columbus himself from Hispaniola. He became devotedly attached to the young slave, and we can well imagine how the young Castilian, in obedience to the injunctions of the Church to masters in respect to the religious instruction of their slaves, taught the beautiful and tender precepts of religion to the Carib slave, while the latter, no doubt, hummed, in the gilded palace of Las Casas, the wild ditties he had learned in his native island when free. These were drowned in the softer and gentler notes of the *Salve Regina*, sung from the gentle heart of the young Las Casas. It was thus from the practical lessons of slavery that the illustrious Las Casas became the most eminent of liberators. When Isabella, rising above the age in which she lived and of the country over which she ruled, ordered the liberation of the Carib slaves sent to Spain from Hispaniola, Las Casas gave up his slave. And when the just queen no doubt tendered compensation to her subjects for their losses in the venture, we can see in imagination the young Castilian giving up his slave and refusing the guerdon.

History is said to revolve like a wheel, perpetually repeating its own lessons. Thus, we remember well, in our own country, in our own times, and in our own personal experience, a repetition of the scene at the palace of Las Casas in Seville, between the young Carib and his gentle master, a repetition which occurred at the capital of our own country. Hereditary slavery existed in the District of Columbia, as a former part of the State of Maryland, and, like the young Castilian, the present writer owned hereditary slaves, received from his ancestors. The institution in old Catholic Maryland was a paternal relation, and sweet, gentle and tender were the dealings of Catholic masters with their slaves. Well do we remember how it was one of the religious duties we learned with our catechism and prayers, enjoined both by parent and priest, that we should instruct the family slaves in their religious lessons, duties, and devotions, and how, in the Land of Mary, a land still blessed under the *Auspice Maria*, we taught to our hereditary bondsmen, like the young Castilian four hundred years ago at Seville, the sweet melodies of the *Ave Maria*. The edict of emancipation from Queen Isabella, in 1495, found its counterpart or supplement in the Emancipation Act of Congress when signed by President Lincoln, by which our own and all the slaves in the District of Columbia were liberated. Scarcely had the President's name been signed to the Act, when it was known in every household in Washington. We saw the chains fall from the hands of about three thousand manumitted slaves then made freemen; we saw the implements and badges of service fall from their hands and persons suddenly while in the very act of service. The government pro-

vided compensation for the losses of the masters, as, no doubt, did Queen Isabella. But, while we saw neighbors, friends and kindred receiving the proffered compensation, we refused, as did the young Las Casas, to accept the price of human liberty. No consideration could ever induce a person who had once witnessed human slavery, even under the most favorable circumstances, ever to rivet again the chains which have once been broken. It was thus, too, with Las Casas. From being a slave-owner he became the greatest of emancipators, the most powerful and earnest advocate of human liberty. So, too, has been our own experience. In the article on "The New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century," in this REVIEW, an earnest appeal was made to Americans to unite with and support the noble efforts of Cardinal Lavigerie and Pope Leo XIII. It is a remarkable fact, that the greatest emancipators have sprung from conditions of society in which slavery existed. Isabella had seen thousands of the conquered Moors from Granada, by the authority of Ferdinand and herself, sold into slavery, and yet, when she saw the Carib slaves from the New World, in 1495, she issued her emancipation edict. Las Casas, from being a slaveholder, became the first of human liberators. Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, sons of Virginia, the heart of the slave territory of this country, announced their advocacy of gradual and peaceable emancipation in the last century, and before any record we have been able to find of an abolition society in Massachusetts. A native of Virginia, where he and his parents lived in the midst of slavery, and afterwards a citizen of the slave State of Kentucky, was no less a person than Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of American slaves. Cardinal Lavigerie, the leader of the *New Crusade of the Nineteenth Century*, is a bishop in Africa, and a resident of the Dark Continent, and we expect to show that Christopher Columbus was no advocate or friend of human slavery.

One of the first acts of Columbus in the New World, on his first voyage, was to liberate Indians from the slavery to which they had been doomed by their Spanish captors. While coasting along Hispaniola on his return from his first voyage to the New World, Columbus was rejoined by Martin Alonzo Pinzon, who had deserted the Admiral; and on discovering that Pinzon had on board his ship four Indian men and two girls whom he had violently seized on leaving the Rio de Gracia, and whom he intended to carry to Spain and sell as slaves, Columbus at once liberated them and sent them back with presents to their own homes. The enmity of Pinzon, greatly intensified by this noble interference, was the result of this emancipation. So on many other occasions he guarded the liberty of the natives. On his return from the second expedition, food became so scarce that some

of the Spanish crew and passengers in their despair proposed to kill the Indian prisoners on board the ship and to allay the pangs of their own hunger by eating their Indian fellow-passengers, while others proposed to throw the Indians overboard and thus leave fewer mouths to feed. "But the Admiral," says Tarducci, "with all the force of his will and his authority, opposed the injustice, showing them that every consideration of humanity and of religion ought to convince them what a horrid infamy it would be to give way to the thought, and encouraged them to hope for relief, for they would soon reach the end of their troubles. His words were received by all with a smile of scornful incredulousness." And yet he succeeded in saving the Indians from such a fate as they might have expected from cannibals rather than Christians.

The peaceful Indians of Hispaniola had long been subjected to raids from their Carib and cannibal neighbors, who, besides murdering them, carried many of their men and women into slavery. Columbus defended his Indian subjects, at their earnest request, from these destructive and enslaving attacks, and in these wars with the Caribs, many prisoners were taken in arms and in the heat of battle. The first proposition of Columbus was to send these prisoners of war to Spain to be sold as slaves for account of the government, and with the view that they might be taught Spanish and the Christian religion, and afterwards return to the New World to serve as interpreters, instructors and missionaries amongst the Indians. This suggestion of Columbus had for its object the protection of the peaceful Indians of Hispaniola from the cannibals, and the reformation of the criminals themselves by what the Jesuit Father Knight calls "a little penal servitude." Well has it been said that this was a mild measure compared with that of King Ferdinand in sending into slavery so many thousands of brave and unoffending Moors, for the sole offence of defending their homes and their country. Were the cannibals to be left free to enslave others rather than be themselves subjected to a servitude so well calculated to improve their condition? Had the question been confined to these murderous and enslaving cannibals, there would be less embarrassment; but it turned out in the course of the Spanish régime in the New World, that the Spaniards had to put down Indian rebellions by the sword, and wars with the Indians were of no rare occurrence. Prisoners of war were frequently taken with arms in their hands, and it became a grave question how to dispose of them. Tarducci states that the theologians of that day and of that country had decided that prisoners of war, taken with arms in their hands, might be treated in the way that Columbus had suggested. Ferdinand and Isabella, his own sovereigns, and in

whose service he was now acting, had, under his own eyes, at the fall of Malaga, permitted, if not ordered, eleven thousand individuals, of both sexes, whose gallant defence of their country should have inspired respect if not admiration in their conquerors, to be dragged from their families, separated from each other, and sold into slavery. It should also be considered that Columbus was not acting in his own interest but in that of his sovereigns. It was a significant fact that he was all the time under great pressure from the crown for revenue and income from the New World. On his return to Hispaniola on this third expedition, disappointments of the keenest kind awaited him; the hopes he had entertained and reported to the crown of vast expected riches and revenues were shattered; and he was compelled to send back a part of his fleet with little of value instead of the rich cargoes of gold expected by the sovereigns. The king was all the time pressing him for remittances of gold, and his enemies at court, Margarite, Boil and Fonseca, were taunting him with the poor returns sent from his expeditions and accusing him of fraud and deception in his reports to the crown. Instead of sending rich cargoes of gold, he was compelled to urge the crown to send out further supplies of everything necessary for the new, struggling and endangered colony. It was under such circumstances that Columbus sent to Spain the Indian prisoners of war taken with arms in their hands. Isabella submitted the question of enslaving these poor creatures to the judgment of learned and pious theologians; and such was the divergency of opinions amongst them, that the queen's generosity solved the knotty question by decreeing the freedom of the Indians. It is not at all probable, or even possible, that Las Casas, the great and uncompromising friend and liberator of the Indians, would have looked leniently or apologetically on this action of Columbus if there had not been many and strong extenuating circumstances. This good and just friend and advocate of human liberty saw readily how Columbus could have fallen into such an error of judgment, for he said, "If those learned and pious persons, whom the sovereigns had chosen as guides, were so blind to the injustice of the practice, we must not wonder that the Admiral, who had not studied as much as they, fell into the error." Mr. Irving, in relating the fact of sending Indians to Spain as slaves by Columbus, says: "In so doing he sinned against the natural goodness of his character and against the feelings which he had originally entertained and expressed towards this gentle and hospitable people; but he was goaded on by the mercenary impatience of the crown and by the sneers of his enemies at the unprofitable result of his enterprises. It is but justice to his character to observe that the enslavement of the Indians thus

taken in battle was at first openly countenanced by the crown, and that when the question of right came to be discussed at the entreaty of the queen, several of the most distinguished jurists and theologians advocated the practice; so the question was finally settled in favor of the Indians solely by the humanity of Isabella." Tarducci, while not approving of this course, says: "But it is not by the standard of our own times that we must judge this deed, for that would unfairly aggravate the fault of Christopher Columbus; we should regard the ideas and customs of his age, when the trade in human flesh shocked nobody; and it was the general opinion that the Christian was the absolute master of the property and life of the infidel. The selling of human beings had long been carried on by the Spaniards and Portuguese in their possessions in Africa, where the slave trade was a great source of profit. And without going out of Europe, in Spain itself, in the presence of the sovereigns and persons of eminent dignity and learning, both secular and ecclesiastic, Columbus had seen repeated instances of how infidels were treated. During the war against the Moors, it was always the practice to make sudden raids into their land and to carry off human creatures as well as beasts, and not only warriors taken with arms in their hands, but quiet peasants, simple villagers, helpless women and children, who were dragged to the markets of Seville and other large cities, and there sold as slaves. The taking of Malaga had presented a memorable instance. To punish a long and noble resistance which their enemies ought to have admired, eleven thousand individuals of both sexes, of every condition and age, were suddenly dragged from their houses, separated from each other, and reduced to the vilest slavery, after the half of the ransom had been paid." Father Knight, in his "Life of Columbus," speaking of the blame which Mr. Irving and others cast upon Columbus for an act which he performed in keeping with the practices of the age and country, says: "This is unjust to Columbus. Irving omits an important extenuating circumstance. The Indians sent by Columbus to Spain were not, like the unhappy negroes in the detestable traffic which began later, torn from their homes and peaceful employments without a shadow of provocation, but they were prisoners who had been taken with arms in their hands in the first battles with the cacique, Guacanagari, who had caused many Spaniards to be put to death. They were prisoners of war, and in some sense their liberty was forfeit. Even in our own days prisoners of war have been detained like malefactors in close confinement for a considerable time. It would be wrong to palliate the slave trade in any form, but it must be admitted that the action of Columbus in this matter differs not only in degree but in kind from the odious cruelty of the African slave-dealers. The truth

is, that taking into account the current ideas of his time, he far more deserves praise for protecting the inoffensive than blame for being willing to enslave the hostile Indians of Hispaniola, or the barbarous Caribs of Guadalupe."

The event of all this was to win and immortalize three illustrious champions of human liberty. Isabella, who had seen thousands of the conquered Moors sent into slavery, decreed the liberty of the Indians. Las Casas, who had been a slave-holder by gift of his father, now became the great emancipator and champion of the Indians. Columbus, who had commenced his career in the New World by liberating the four Indian men and two girls whom Pinzon had seized for the purpose of sending them to Spain to be sold as slaves, and who for a brief period in obedience to the opinions and practices of the age and the urgency of the crown for profits had sent some Indians to Spain as slaves, having always been a friend of the Indians, now on the first intimation of support from the king and queen in favor of desisting from enslaving and of liberating them, returned and ever afterwards adhered to his first and original principles in favor of human liberty and the application of these principles to the Indians.

After the long and life-wearing struggle of Columbus with his ungrateful king, his rising from the bed of sickness, his painful journey on a mule to the court, his following up his suit at court from city to city, the polite deceptions he encountered, the delays, denials, and refusals of justice, such as we have herein described—after the making of his last will and testament, a true mirror and witness of his exalted sentiments and purposes; after all earthly hope of human or royal justice had been smothered in his loyal and trusting heart, the great Admiral, finding his work was done, and seeing with the eyes of faith and hope the crown of heavenly reward awaiting him in another and a better kingdom, in a world both ancient and ever new, a better world for him to make his gallant voyage to—he retired to his lowly inn, his humble cot, to his impoverished little room—to die. The humility of his last surroundings contrasted strangely with the viceregal grandeur, the palaces, the retinues and attendants, the homage of the world, the worship of sovereigns, princes and courtiers, which were all due to the discoverer of a New World, and his by solemn compact, and his to transmit by a good title to his descendants. It is easy to imagine what an humble inn was at that time in Spain, a mere lodging house, destitute of every comfort, cold, untidy, dreary and repulsive. And who cannot in imagination recall that plain little room, destitute of every ornament except the crucifix which the illustrious patient ever pressed to his bosom and his lips? But in recalling the image of that little room, gentle reader, omit not to

see hanging upon its bare walls the very chains in which the most noble of prisoners had been sent back to Spain from the world he had given her. No Roman conqueror could look upon the civic and mural crowns, the rewards of questionable triumphs over vanquished nations, with greater exultation than Columbus felt in contemplating the chains he bore, the only reward he received in return for discovered worlds. In the midst of intensest sufferings, his mind was as clear, his perceptions as lucid, his memory as unerring, and his firmness as unshaken, as when he stood upon his ship on the morning of October 12, 1492, about to land on the island of San Salvador. The soul of Columbus was flooded with torrents of celestial graces. He robed himself with the humble but inspiring habit of the third order of St. Francis, which he had worn so often before in moments of prosperity and adversity. It enveloped his noble but emaciated frame like a mantle of heavenly virtues. It was the same religious mantle which his own beloved queen, Isabella of Castile, had worn when she rendered her pure soul to God. Palace and cabin now are one and alike in the supreme moment of death. Franciscan Fathers attended the expiring Christian, whose every prayer and office of religion found deep response in the soul and voice of the great Admiral. His two devoted sons, Diego and Fernando, some of his officers who were loyal to the last to their chief, the illustrious viceroy of the Indies and Admiral of the ocean seas, and a few loving friends, and these were then few indeed, ministered to the illustrious sufferer, whose bodily pains were forgotten in the ecstatic hopes and visions of Heaven. No thought of earth, of his wrongs, of his indignities, of his injustices, of his ingratitude, weighed upon his devout soul. Not wishing to leave to his sons those chains, hanging upon the wall at this extreme moment still, as a legacy of hatred and revenge, and lest they might enkindle a bitter feeling of resentment in their hearts against an unjust king, Columbus ordered his chains to be removed from human sight and buried with him. They were his only trophies. Thus his every aspiration and thought was inspired by the grandeur of his whole character, or by the overwhelming tides of grace he then received. While his soul was sighing for the beatific vision, his robust constitution, in the order of nature, made a robust resistance against dissolution. It was a last tribute which earth paid to one of the most gallant and strongest men ever sprung from its bosom. Columbus contemplated with calm resignation the approaches of death. He addressed an edifying exhortation to his attendants. The strong man, who had forgiven all, and who had much to forgive, humbly asked for the Sacrament of Penance once more. Constantly raising his voice and his soul to God, he asked that the

favor and blessing of the Viaticum might be his, and he received again the Saviour, in whose honor he had named the first land he had discovered and landed upon in the New World. He received the Blessed Sacrament, as only apostles and martyrs receive their Saviour. It was Ascension Day, May 30, 1506. The Admiral of the Ocean Seas, the sailor of many voyages, the discoverer of many lands, seemed sailing now in a spiritual sea of seraphic graces. It was thus that after he had received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist, he again emerged from his ecstatic contemplation of that other and better world, and asked for the Sacrament of extreme unction. His last voyage seemed near its end; the great mariner seemed about to enter the port of his supreme hopes. He knew his hour, his very moment, had arrived; and now raising his voice, that voice which had first of men sounded the praises of the true God on the Western Ocean and in the New World, he pronounced his last words, words so worthy of Christopher Columbus, *IN MANUS TUAS, DOMINE, COMMENDO SPIRITUM MEUM.*

It was a Franciscan who had given Columbus bread and water at Rabida; it was the Franciscans of Valladolid who gave him the body and blood of his Saviour; it was the Franciscans who buried his mortal remains in their own monastery at Valladolid. The local annals of that city, which, according to Harris, gave almost every insignificant event of the town from 1333 to 1539, day by day, did not even mention his death; so little heed was taken of the man whose memory now, after four hundred years, is honored by the nations of the world as no other man's memory has been honored. Seven years afterwards King Ferdinand caused his remains to be transferred to Seville, in 1513, where they were interred in the Monastery of La Cuevas of the Carthusians, where afterwards, in 1526, the remains of his elder son and successor and second admiral and viceroy were buried. On the removal of the Admiral's remains, in 1513, to Seville, King Ferdinand bestowed upon Columbus the posthumous honor of a grand funeral. Tradition assigns to the hand of the king the composition of the famous inscription, which was carved on the monument erected in his honor at Valladolid, and which is now generally accepted as the epitaph of Columbus:

À CASTILLA Y A LEON
NUEVO MUNDO DIO COLON.

To Castile and Leon Columbus gave a New World.

But modern historical criticism has found reasons for doubting even these posthumous honors to the memory of Columbus. Mr.

Fiske says these traditions crumble under the touch of historical criticism. But it is certain he was buried at Valladolid in 1506, and that his remains were removed to Seville in 1513. The uncertainty of details is cited as a further proof of the obscurity in which Columbus was permitted to die. The house in which he died was No. 7 Calle de Colon, which is still shown to visitors at Valladolid, just as the supposed house in which he was said to have been born is shown to travellers at Genoa. Subsequently, as is supposed to have been done in deference to the expressed wish of the Admiral, his remains were removed from Seville and interred in the Cathedral of San Domingo. The date of this removal to San Domingo has been variously given as 1537, 1540, and 1541. The fact of their removal and interment at San Domingo is unquestioned. In 1795, by the Treaty of Basle, Spain ceded that end of the island known as San Domingo to France; and then the Spanish government, acting in concert with the Duke of Veragua, the representative of the family of Columbus, and with the consent of France, determined to remove the remains to Spanish soil and to the Island of Cuba. This removal was performed with great pomp and ceremony, and national honors were thus paid to the memory of Columbus. While Columbus made four great voyages across the ocean in his lifetime, it would seem from these accounts that his mortal remains have made the same number of journeys or voyages since his death: first to the Franciscan Convent at Valladolid; thence to the Carthusian Convent at Seville; thence to the Cathedral at San Domingo; and thence and finally to the Cathedral at Havana.

But in 1877 the startling announcement was made from San Domingo that by mistake the remains of the Admiral's son Diego, and not those of the Admiral himself, were removed from San Domingo to Havana in 1795, and they announced that on opening the vaults under the Cathedral of San Domingo in 1877, the remains of Columbus were discovered to be still reposing in the latter place. This statement is denied by the Academy of History at Madrid. Under these circumstances the present resting-place of the Admiral's remains is involved in doubt, as was the place of his birth before this honor was adjudged to Genoa. The controversy over the present resting-place of Columbus has been carried on with great earnestness and zeal by the respective advocates of San Domingo and of Havana, as the respective claimants of the honor. The Cathedral of San Domingo was completed in 1541, and it is supposed that the actual interment of the Admiral's remains at San Domingo was accomplished at that time or not long afterwards. It is alleged that no record of the inter-

ment was made at the time, nor was any record extant showing the exact spot where the remains were interred. The remains of the Admiral's son Diego, and of his brother Bartholomew, his companions in life, were also removed with his from Spain to San Domingo. The importance of an exact record designating the spot in which each of these different remains were interred was not appreciated at the time. There is an entry in the cathedral records of San Domingo that the remains of the great Admiral were interred on the right of the grand altar; but this record is claimed not to have been made until 1676, nor does it seem to be known who wrote this entry in the official record. Some interest now began to attach to the importance of preserving some record and other evidence on the subject, for in 1683, seven years after the record was made to speak on the subject, it was deemed important to secure statements from "the oldest inhabitants" of San Domingo to support and confirm the entry made in 1676. Repairs in the Cathedral of San Domingo were made from time to time, and about the year 1776, when some repairs were being made under the altar and sanctuary, a stone vault, which was believed to be the one containing the Admiral's remains, was found on the gospel side of the altar, while another vault was found on the epistle side, which was supposed to contain the remains of Bartholomew Columbus. But where were the remains of Don Diego Columbus, the second admiral, and of Don Luis Columbus, the third admiral? But in 1795, when the Admiral's remains were removed by the Spanish government to Havana, it was believed there was no question as to the identity of the proper vault, and no one then publicly doubted the removal of the remains of Columbus to Havana, although the report has always had currency at San Domingo that the remains removed to Havana in 1795 were not those of Columbus, but were the remains of one of his sons. In 1877, when the announcement was telegraphed abroad from San Domingo that while excavating near the high altar of the cathedral the casket and bones of Christopher Columbus were found still reposing there, it created great excitement, and led to a bitter controversy which has not yet been authoritatively settled. The removal to Havana was regarded on one hand as too notable an event, and one commenced and conducted with too much notoriety, and care to have failed of its object. The imposing ceremony took place on December 20, 1795, and the disinterment of the Admiral's remains took place in the cathedral in the presence of the governor, the clergy and a large concourse of the people. Solemn obsequies were celebrated with great pomp and ceremony, and the sacred remains were reverently carried from their resting-place to the sea and received on a Spanish vessel

especially suited and prepared for the purpose. The remains were thus respectfully transported to Havana, where again the governor, the clergy and the assembled people joined in the solemn repetition of the funeral services, and the relics of Christopher Columbus were deposited in the Cathedral of Havana, on Spanish soil. It was too notable an event, it has been alleged, to have been done without due and ample recognition and identification. But, on the other hand, in 1877, when the authorities of the San Domingo Cathedral announced their discovery and recognition of the remains of the Admiral still resting there, a solemn and authentic recognition of them was made in the presence of all the ecclesiastical, military and civil authorities of San Domingo, and the crowd of people assembled from far and near to see and honor the remains of Columbus was immense. This, too, was a notable event. In support of this view it is alleged that not only had the remains of Christopher Columbus been deposited under the altar of the San Domingo Cathedral, but also those of Don Diego Columbus, his son and first successor, those of his grandson, Don Luis Columbus, and those of his brother Bartholomew. In the repeated repairs done to the chapel and sanctuary, the grand altar several times changed its place, and the various caskets were thus liable to be mistaken one for another. The Most Rev. Rocco Cocchia, Bishop of Oropesa and Apostolic Delegate to San Domingo, was the official who made the repairs in 1877, and who discovered there the remains of the Admiral; and as the fact was so earnestly disputed, he continued the investigations, clearly fixed the dates, and on searching for the remains of Don Diego and of Don Luis only one of them was found, and this was inscribed with the name of Don Luis, thus clearly showing that it was the remains of Don Diego Columbus which were removed to Havana in 1795. These facts have been disputed by the Academy of History at Madrid, by whom it is alleged that those features of the inscription on the leaden box found in 1877, which were claimed to prove it to be the casket containing the remains of the first Admiral, were fraudulently added or altered. Much has been said, written and published on the subject, and while those more immediately interested in the question claim the precious deposit, each for its own soil and country, impartial general historians take opposing sides, thus leaving the controversy undecided.

Since his death, and especially in recent times, many splendid monuments have been erected to the memory of Christopher Columbus, and many more in numbers, and much grander and enduring, are now being erected or will soon be commenced.

The posthumous honors now rendered to the memory of Christopher Columbus have never been equalled in any other instance

in the history of the world and of its heroes. King Ferdinand is said to have been, as he should have been, the first to erect a statue to Columbus, reference being here made to the monument he is supposed to have erected at Seville at the time of the removal of the admiral's remains from Valladolid to Seville in 1509 or 1513, and on which was inscribed the royal epitaph already quoted as written by the hand of the king; but the existence of such a monument is now greatly doubted, while in the Carthusian church of Seville there is a slab on which is inscribed that famous distich. Most of the statues erected in honor of Columbus have been built within very recent years, and now the number of statues about to be so erected will probably exceed all previous ones. It is a singular and interesting fact that the first monument we have been able to trace out as having been erected in honor of Columbus was raised and now stands in the city of Baltimore, thus giving Baltimore another claim to the title of Monumental City. It is now still a more interesting fact that this monument was erected on October 12, 1792, the tri-centennial of the discovery of America. It was erected by Charles Francis Adrian le Paulmier Chevalier d'Amour, who came to this country with the Count de Grasse, and settled in Baltimore after the fall of Yorktown, on his country estate, and there on an elevated plateau erected this monument to Columbus, of bricks brought from England and covered with mortar or cement. The estate afterwards had several successive owners, and among them was David Barnum, in 1833, the famous hosteler of Baltimore, from whom old Barnum's Hotel was named. The land now belongs to the Samuel Ready Orphan Asylum for Girls. This interesting monument stands over fifty feet high among the branches of a centennial oak tree, and is near North and Harford avenues, Baltimore. Genoa, his native city, has two statues of Columbus, one of which is a bust on a pedestal, and was erected in 1821; the other is a much larger and finer monument and was finished in 1862. In the plaza at San Domingo, to the west of the cathedral, stands a fine bronze statue of Columbus, of heroic size, and standing on a granite pedestal about fourteen feet high. Midway on the pedestal is the graceful figure of an Indian girl, apparently in the act of climbing up the pedestal, and with her right hand extended and uplifted, writing on the slab the same inscription, in fac-simile, which is found on the inside of the lid of the casket of Columbus at San Domingo. This beautiful figure is said to represent the famous Indian queen, Anacaona, "the Golden Flower," Queen of Zaragua, a faithful friend of the white men, and who by treachery, after the fall and return of Columbus to Spain, met a fate at once cruel beyond description and disgraceful to our civilization. Her pathetic history is preserved in all the biographies

of Columbus. The date of this impressive monument we have not ascertained. In Lima is a grand and colossal statue of the admiral, erected in 1850. In Nassau, New Providence, is a statue, the Admiral in marble holding an iron sword. So also in the public square at Cardenas, Cuba, is a fine statue, and in Madrid another has recently been completed. On the left of the grand portico of the Capitol at Washington is a bold marble statue of Columbus advancing with majestic step and holding a small globe in his hand, while an Indian woman is standing at his side. In a recent visit which we paid to Sacramento, the capital of California, we saw with delight a beautiful group in marble; Queen Isabella is in the act of offering her jewels for the discovery of the New World. Columbus is standing on her right, triumphant over all obstacles, and admiring her magnanimity. Santangel, the treasurer of Aragon, who raised the needed money from the treasury and saved the jewels, is standing expressively and characteristically on the left. There are, no doubt, many other statues and monuments of our hero, already erected, which are not generally known, and still many more now in course of erection or about to be undertaken. Most prominent among the latter will be the colossal statue of Columbus which will soon be erected in Central Park, New York City, by the contributions of the Italian residents and citizens of the United States. The figure will be thirteen feet high, and the shaft and pedestal sixty-two feet high, and with the heavy stone foundation the head of the figure will be eighty-four feet from the ground. The statue and pedestal will all be of marble, and all will be made in Italy. At the foot of the circular marble shaft will stand four figures: one representing a Spaniard, another an American, a third an Italian, and the fourth a winged spirit. Several designs were presented for acceptance, and all were referred to a jury of eminent artists and sculptors, such as Monteverdi, Farrari, Salvini, Calderini and Maccari, and by their verdict the design of Gaetano Russo was selected, and this talented and distinguished sculptor is now engaged on the work in Italy and will come to America to superintend its erection. Indeed, the vessel bearing the statue and artist is on its way. The artist gives his services to this patriotic work gratuitously; the actual outlay will be about thirty-five thousand dollars, and it is estimated that if Russo were to accept compensation, the entire cost of the statue would amount to one hundred thousand dollars.

There are many historical paintings of the discovery of America, the most prominent one in this country being the large panel picture of that subject in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington, in which the figure of the Admiral is grand and majestic. There is also a splendid bronze door in the Capitol representing in bas-

reliefs the principal scenes in the life of Columbus. In the Catholic University of Notre Dame, Indiana, is a series of fresco paintings by Gregori, representing also scenes in the life of Columbus. The great discoverer is the leading figure in many noble works of art throughout the world. No events in the history of mankind form such apt and worthy subjects for the skill of the painter, sculptor and engraver.

It is to be regretted that the world does not possess a single thoroughly authenticated portrait of Columbus. There are many portraits with various claims of originality, but they would scarcely be taken for likenesses of the same person. The likeness of Columbus has been minutely drawn in words, as we have already given it in a previous article, and from this description of his personal appearance we might suppose that an artist could paint his portrait. We also mentioned, in the July number of this REVIEW, that in the legendary pictures of St. Christopher, represented as a giant saint carrying the infant Christ upon his shoulders across mighty waters, Christopher Columbus was thus typified by his patron saint, and that in one of the first maps or charts of the New World, perhaps the very first, that made by a great geographer and contemporary of Columbus, Juan de la Casa, in a little vignette at a corner of the map or chart the features of the great discoverer were substituted for those of the saint, and so exact was the likeness that the author of the map considered them sufficient and omitted the name of Columbus from the map. If this map and likeness of Columbus could be obtained, it would seem to have the credit at least of having been made in his life-time. Mr. W. E. Curtis, an official of the Columbian World's Fair at Chicago, and the one specially charged with procuring a portrait of Columbus, has stated lately that this miniature is preserved in the marine archives of Spain. The map and vignette are painted on a cow-hide, as was then quite frequently done, and as La Casa was a pilot of the Admiral, he may be credited with a good knowledge of his features; but how far even the pilot of Columbus could claim sufficient artistic skill to reproduce them, and especially the expression, tints of the complexion and of the eyes, or how far, even if gifted with artistic skill, he could do what few artists can do, produce a correct likeness from memory, we are not informed. Mr. Curtis has declared his purpose of endeavoring to procure for the Columbian Exposition, if possible, this precious souvenir of the Admiral.

There is another portrait for which authenticity and originality are claimed; it is the portrait of the Admiral in De Bry's "*Voyages*," and of which the author gives the following account: "As Columbus was a man of intelligence and endowed with great ge-

nius and spirit, the king and queen of Castile, before his departure directed his portrait to be painted by a skilful artist, that they might have a memorial of him in case he should not return from his expedition. Of this portrait I have had the good fortune to obtain a copy, since finishing the fourth volume of this work, from a friend who had received it from the artist himself; and it has been my desire, kind reader, to have this pleasure with you, for which purpose I have caused it to be engraved in reduced form, on copper, by my son, with as much care as possible, and now offer it for your inspection in this book; and, in truth, the portrait of one possessing such excellence deserves to be seen by all good men; for he was upright and courteous, pure and noble-minded, and an earnest friend of peace and justice."

Mr. Irving used several different portraits in the several editions of his "Life of Columbus." In his earlier edition, he used the portrait of the Admiral painted by Anthony Moore, of Utrecht, a favorite of Philip II., having selected it after two years' search for the best portrait. But in the Hudson edition of Mr. Irving's works quite another portrait is used, and there is little resemblance between the two. But in the National and Author's revised edition, he uses De Bry's portrait, and gives it the preference over the others without vouching for its authenticity, saying, it "is evidently the most characteristic and the most likely to be the true one." This portrait is said to be similar to the one ascribed to Bartolomeo Guardo, and possessed by Dr. Alessandro di Orchi, of Como, and said to have formerly belonged to the historian Paolo Giovio, of Como, bishop of Nocera (1483-1552), who knew Columbus and visited him several times during his stay in Rome. It is also alleged that Giovio only received into his gallery works of the greatest masters and of the highest merit, such as Titian, Bronzino, Sebastiano del Piombo, and others of like celebrity. It is a tradition that Titian painted a portrait of Columbus about thirty or forty years after the Admiral's death. Could the di Orchi portrait have been painted by Titian? Besides Titian, the portrait of Columbus was, about the same time after his death, painted by other eminent masters. This portrait is said to represent Columbus as bearing a strong resemblance to General Washington.

The original portrait of Columbus, said to have been painted by Chevalier Antonus Moor van Dashorst, 1519-1575, already mentioned above as used by Mr. Irving in his earlier editions of the "Life of Columbus," is now said to be in this country. It was lately purchased by Mr. Charles F. Gunther, a wealthy confectioner of Chicago, and intended to form one of the attractions of the approaching Columbian Exposition. This portrait is supposed to have been painted in 1570, from two miniatures owned by Mar-

garet of Parma, regent under Philip II. of the Netherlands, natural daughter of Charles V. and Margaret Van Gest, wife, in turn, of Alessandro de Medicis, duke of Florence, and Octavio Farnèse, duke of Parma and Piäcenza, and mother of the celebrated Alessandro Farnèse. Mr. Curtis, of the Columbian World's Fair, does not allow full credit to this portrait, nor to seventeen others which he himself possesses. Should he become the possessor of the features of Christopher Columbus painted on the body of St. Christopher, in the map or chart of La Casa, as he proposes to do, no doubt attempted discredit will be thrown upon that also by the owner of some rival production.

Mention has already been made of the Duke of Veragua. Luis, the grandson of Columbus, and third Admiral, exchanged the hereditary dignities and titles of the Columbus family for the dukedom of Veragua and a pension. His daughter married her cousin, Diego Columbus, and, having died without issue, the male line of the Admiral became extinct. In 1608, the title and property were merged, by marriage through the female line, in a younger branch of the royal house of Bragança, and are now represented by the present Duke of Veragua, who is said to bear a family resemblance to the Great Discoverer. The Duke takes a lively interest in the approaching Columbian celebrations in America and Spain. It is not improbable that he may come to America to join in our festivities. The ducal mansion is full of manuscripts and other memorials of his illustrious ancestor. He considers the portrait of Columbus in the National Library at Madrid, and recently restored and engraved by the Royal Historical Society, the most authentic; and the best statue is that surmounting the Madrid monument. There are many spots in Europe now hallowed by the posthumous glories of Columbus. In the splendid Cathedral of Burgos, to whose sacred shrine Columbus, on his return from his second voyage in 1496, accompanied by, and kneeling beside, Ferdinand and Isabella, joined in chanting the *Te Deum*, there is a magnificent altar, which is decorated with gold brought by him from America at that time, and so applied by order of the queen. In Valladolid is the grand audience chamber in the palace, where Isabella received the Admiral; and in the narrow street, Calle Ancha de la Magdalena, stands the humble inn or house, Number 2, over whose portal is the inscription, "Here died Columbus." There, too, is the Convent of St. Francis, in which his remains were first interred. In the Museum here, are memorials of Columbus, as well as of Cabot, Vespuccius, and Verrazana, participators with him in American discoveries. At Salamanca is the great university where the proposals of Columbus were explained, discussed, and rejected, and—an interesting fact it is—here, too, the system

of Copernicus was expounded. In the National Library at Madrid are seen an original letter addressed by him to Ferdinand and Isabella and an unsigned MS. in his hand-writing. Also, the fine portrait by an Italian artist which the Duke of Veragua regards as the best, and of which there are three excellent copies in this country—one in the Geographical Society's collection in New York city; one in the Colby University of Maine; and the third in the collection of the Historical Society of Wisconsin. In the Marine Hospital at Madrid, is a fine model of Columbus's first flag-ship, the *Santa Maria*, and in the Royal Armory, a complete set of armor worn by him. In the Senate chamber is a splendid painting representing Columbus explaining his theories to a body of incredulous *savans*; and in the National Gallery is a fine picture of his triumphal reception at Barcelona; and in the Senate Chamber is a noble marble statue of the Admiral by Samartin, representing him as he saw the torch on shore on the night of October 11, 1492. In the Library of the King of Spain is a splendidly illuminated missal, with an inscription in gold stating that Ferdinand and Isabella had ornamented this great book with the first fruits of the Indies. Besides the papers, portraits and other memorials in the residence of the Duke of Veragua, another Spanish nobleman has a sword worn by Columbus, and a small gold box or jewel-case given by him to his son Diego. The Duke of Ossuna has an authentic manuscript copy of his diary; and a Spanish hidalgo has a massive gold ring which was worn by Columbus. In the Cathedral of Toledo is a gigantic St. Christopher, painted in fresco, in honor of Columbus; and the cathedral possesses a grand library, in which, however, a beautiful copy of the "*Epistola Christofori Colon*" is valued more than any other of the 40,000 volumes. At Cordova is visited the celebrated mosque wherein Columbus is said to have first seen Isabella—this being the second place in which he is said to have seen her first—and afterwards saw Cardinal Ximenes; and in the cathedral grounds he is said to have first seen the beautiful Andalusian lady, Beatrix Enriquez, who became his second wife, and the mother of his son Fernando. Her portrait is preserved in Seville; and at Cordova is shown the house of Columbus and Beatrix, in which Fernando was born. The cities of Seville, San Sebastian, Salamanca, Burgos, Valladolid, and Madrid, have streets named in his honor, and New York city has recently changed its common-place Ninth Avenue into the more fashionable Columbus Avenue.

In Seville is a residence of Columbus and the famous Columbus Library of 33,000 volumes, founded by his son Fernando, who was his father's historian; in this library are preserved many precious books of the Admiral. In the splendid Cathedral of Seville is the

tomb of Fernando Columbus, with the inscription, "To Castile and Leon, Columbus gave a New World," pictures of the ships which carried the Admiral's first expedition, and a large cross made of the first gold Columbus brought from America, and in the ex-queen's Moorish palace is an admirably carved group representing the Admiral kneeling in prayer before his first departure from Palos. In the India House at Seville are preserved manuscripts and portraits of Columbus, Cortez and Pizarro; and in that city is seen an ancient elaborately carved writing desk, once the property of Columbus. In Granada is shown the battle-flag under which Columbus fought during the siege of Malaga and elsewhere in the Moorish wars; there too is the tomb of Isabella, and the casket in which the queen is said to have collected funds to defray the expenses of Columbus's expedition, and inscribed, "Queen Isabella's Columbus casket." In the Alhambra is preserved the golden crown of Isabella made of the gold which the Admiral brought home, and here is seen the jewelled sceptre of Ferdinand. It was from this famous Moorish palace that Isabella despatched Columbus to discover the New World, and here too he was received by the sovereigns after his return in chains; and here are shown the suite of small apartments in which Washington Irving wrote his "Life of Columbus," at the famous sherry wine market, Jerez, where is still made the famous brand of sherry known as "The bones of Columbus." Not only is Cadiz reverently visited as the port from which the second expedition sailed, but also Palos, where members of the Pinzon and other families containing descendants of Columbus's companies, are still persons of historical note; but here too in Palos is seen the ancient monastery of La Rabida, and the great stone at the foot of which Columbus knelt with his son Diego to invoke the blessing of Heaven on his first expedition. In Italy are many venerated relics of Columbus. At Cogoletto is pointed out the house which is claimed to be the one in which he was born; in Genoa is shown the place where stood the residence of his father, Domenico Colombo. Besides the great Genoese monument of Columbus, near it stands a handsome public building, whose façade bears the inscription "Christopher Columbus, Genoese, discovered America." In the *Municipio*, or council hall, are preserved many autograph letters of Columbus, also a grand bust of him, of heroic size, the gift of Venice to Genoa, and a large mosaic portrait of Columbus, by the side of a similar one of Marco Polo. In the Centureoni Palace is a valuable portrait of the Admiral, similar to that in the National Library of Spain, and in another private palace is a beautiful bronze statue of the great Discoverer, executed in 1851. At Pisa Columbus had the honor of being carved in oak in the chair of the grand Cathedral. In the

Uffizi Palace at Florence, there is a celebrated portrait of Columbus, and in the adjoining Pitti Palace is a bronze statue with four figures surrounding it, by Professor Costoli; and in the Brignolia Palace Columbus is the central figure of a fine bronze statuette group. In Genoa, Bologna, Florence, Milan, Rome, Turin, Naples and other Italian cities, may be seen *vias corsos*, and *piazos* named Colombo, and in Italian collections are countless portraits and statues of the great Genoese. In Rome is a large bust of Columbus by Faventurus, presented to the Museum in 1818 by Canova, and at Venice is the noble monument of Canova in the Franciscan Church. In Naples is a noble painting by Molinavo, in which Columbus, obscure and poor, is explaining his great plan to the Prior of La Rabida and his monks, while his son Diego is in the background receiving bread and water from the porter. At the Naples Hospital is a splendid marble group, life-sized, of Columbus, Dante Giotto, and St. Francis of Assisi. In the Marciano Library at Venice is a large sixteenth century map, with a full length portrait of Columbus and another of Marco Polo. There are now found at Genoa, Savona, Meglia and other neighborhoods of Genoa, members of the Colombo family still living.

San Domingo, too, is a city full of traditions, memories and relics of Columbus. After abandoning the first city, Isabella, Columbus founded and built the city of San Domingo, adjacent to the newly discovered mines of gold: it is a walled city, built after the Spanish style, contains to-day about fifteen thousand inhabitants and is the oldest European settlement in the world of Columbus. The walls were built in 1504, and so solidly that they are now in good preservation. It is built on a bluff facing the Caribbean Sea, at the mouth of the Ozama River, near the mines, and here the ships of Columbus rode at anchor in his later expeditions. At the entrance of the river in the southeast bastion is the famous Homenaji, or castle, still formidable with its ports and turrets, and in it is still shown to visitors the room in which Columbus was imprisoned and chained. A little further along the Ozama stand the ruins of the viceregal palace built by Diego Columbus, son and successor of the great Admiral. What was three and a half centuries ago the centre of European power in America, whose halls were graced by the beauty and chivalry of Spanish America, led by the second Admiral and Viceroy and the first vice-queen, the lovely Dona Maria de Toledo, niece of the illustrious Duke of Alva, is now reduced to the humble uses of a stable and hen-coop. A little further to the left is now seen the little chapel built by Columbus, the shrine where he often prayed and suffered. Near to this is the famous sundial he erected at a cost of \$60,000, and which is still in use. The city with its ancient ruins and buildings, its massive walls, its low

built houses with courtyards and ample doors, and gardens; its fountains, plaza, convents and churches, narrow sidewalks, is a picturesque sight. Here too, trod Columbus and his sons and brothers, the great and venerable Las Casas, Cortez, Pizarro, the conquered Indian chiefs, and many other historical characters, including the noted Alonzo de Ovido, the undaunted hero of many reckless deeds, who is buried under the arch of the Franciscan Convent now in ruins, the grave being so placed as he directed, and said, "that every one who entered there might tread upon his grave and be reminded of the instability of human fortune." A half a mile above the city, on the banks of the Ozama is the Well of Columbus, which is still running. Amid the many quaint buildings of the city and above them all towers the fine Cathedral, facing the Plaza, and measuring two hundred feet in length and one hundred in width, and cruciform. It is sombre and imposing in its exterior and interior. Its interior is devotional, and rich in historic memories of the great Admiral. On the right opposite the main door, embedded in the wall of a small chapel, is the mahogany cross which Columbus erected "to the glory of God," on the mountain of Santo Cerro, where he gazed admiringly down upon the Royal Vega. Facing the chancel upon the right is a small dark chapel, where rests the grave of the bishop who founded the sacred structure surmounted by his recumbent statue, and beyond this is a low dark vault, to which leads a low barred door, lighted by a dim taper; the vault is sacredly guarded, for here rests the casket containing, as the San Domingoans contend, the mortal remains of Columbus. Fronting the same plaza is the Columbian monument and statue already mentioned. Only visitors of eminence are allowed to enter the vault of Columbus and then only by special permission; the visit must be made in the presence of three officials and the visitors, officials and all present must sign their names in a book kept for that purpose; then the glass casket is brought from the vault; it is well secured with bands and sealed with the seal of the State. Within the casket is a small open zinc box containing a few human bones and a glass vase or jar containing human dust. These relics are claimed to be all that is mortal remaining of the great Admiral. The same claim is made on behalf of the Cathedral of Havana. It is to be lamented that this controversy exists in relation to the last resting place of so illustrious a benefactor of mankind.

The most signal posthumous honor paid to the memory of Columbus is that magnificent circular letter issued in his honor by the illustrious Pontiff, Leo XIII., on July 16, 1892, and addressed to the archbishops and bishops of Spain, Italy and the two Americas. It would be a satisfaction, if space permitted, to lay the

entire letter of our Holy Father before our readers in the pages of this REVIEW, *in perpetuam rei memoriam*, but a passage or two must now suffice :

"From the end of the fifteenth century, when a man from Liguria first landed, under the auspices of God, on the transatlantic shores, humanity has been strongly inclined to celebrate with gratitude the recollection of this event. It would certainly not be an easy matter to find a more worthy cause to touch their hearts and to inflame their zeal. The event, in effect, is such in itself that no other epoch has seen a grander and more beautiful one accomplished by man ; as to him who accomplished it, there are few who can be compared with him in greatness of soul and of genius. By his work a new world flashed forth from the unexplored ocean ; thousands upon thousands of mortals were returned to the common society of the human race, led from their barbarous life to peacefulness and civilization, and, what is of much more importance, recalled from perdition to eternal life by the bestowal of the gifts which Jesus Christ brought to the world.

"Europe, astonished alike by the novelty and the prodigiousness of this unexpected event, understood little by little, in due course of time what she owed to Columbus, when by sending colonies to America, by frequent communications, by exchange of services, by the resources confided to the sea and received in return, there was discovered an accession of the most favorable character possible to the knowledge of nature, to the reciprocal abundance of riches, with the result that the prestige of Europe increased enormously.

"Therefore it would not be fitting, amid these numerous testimonials of honor and in these concerts of felicitations, that the Church should maintain complete silence, since, in accordance with her character and her institution, she willingly approves and endeavors to favor all that appears, wherever it is, to be worthy of honor and praise. Undoubtedly she reserves particular and supreme honors to the virtues pre-eminent in regard to morality, inasmuch as they concern the eternal salvation of souls ; nevertheless she does not despise the rest, neither does she abstain from esteeming them as they deserve ; it is even her habit to favor with all her power and to have in honor, those who have well merited of human society and who have passed to posterity.

"Certainly God is admirable in His saints ; but the vestiges of His divine virtue appear as imprinted in those in whom shines a superior force of soul and mind, for this elevation of heart and this spark of genius could only come from God, their author and protector.

"There is in addition an entirely special reason for which we believe we should commemorate in a grateful spirit this immortal event.

It is that Columbus is one of us. When one considers with what motive above all he undertook the plan of exploring the dark sea, and with what object he endeavored to realize this plan, one cannot doubt that the Catholic faith superlatively inspired the enterprise and its execution, so that by this title also humanity is indebted to the Church.

"Then, once fairly at sea, while the waters agitate themselves, while the crew murmurs, he maintains, under God's care, a calm constancy of mind. His plan manifests itself in the very names which he imposes on the new islands, and each time that he is called upon to land upon one of them he worships the Almighty God, and only takes possession of it in the name of Jesus Christ.

"Whatever coast he approaches, his first idea is to plant on the shore the sacred sign of the cross; and the divine name of the Redeemer, which he had sung so frequently on the open sea, to the sound of the murmuring waves—he is the first to make it reverberate in the new islands. In the same way, when he institutes the Spanish colony, he causes it to be commenced by the construction of a temple, where he first provides that the popular fetes shall be celebrated by august ceremonies.

"In order to celebrate worthily and in a manner suitable to the truth of the facts the solemn anniversary of Columbus, the sacredness of religion must be united to the splendor of the civil pomp. This is why, as previously, at the first announcement of the event public acts of thanksgiving were rendered to the providence of the immortal God, upon the example which the Supreme Pontiff gave, the same also now, in celebrating the recollection of the auspicious event. We esteem that we must do as much.

"We decree to this effect that the day of October 12th or the following Sunday, if the respective diocesan bishops judge it to be opportune, after the office of the day, the solemn Mass of the Most Holy Trinity shall be celebrated in the cathedral and collegial churches of Spain, Italy and the two Americas."

It is quite unnecessary to advert in detail to the movements now made throughout the world, and especially in America, Spain and Italy, to celebrate with unparalleled splendor the achievement of Columbus in this the quadri-centennial of that peerless event in the history of the world. That the government and people of the United States have expended many millions in preparations to hold the Columbian World's Fair in honor of the Admiral, that the grandest naval review ever held will now be given by the navies of all nations in the harbor of New York, that the day designated according to the new style, or Gregorian calendar, on the 21st of October, has been made a national holiday, that grand national and local celebrations will be held throughout the land, and solemn

religious services and thanksgivings will be held in every diocese in the country, and celebrations more or less similar to these will be held in Spain and Italy, and in the other countries of the two Americas, are only so many evidences of the unequalled posthumous honors now and everywhere heaped upon the name and memory of Columbus. And as future centuries roll around the name and memory of Columbus will be venerated with imperishable honors.

Among the posthumous honors rendered to Christopher Columbus has been a reaction, natural though limited, yet increasing, in favor of the name of Columbia. Our study of the subject has led us to observe that, while America is the legal, practical, and everyday name of our country, yet wherever there is question or sentiment of an ideal country—a country of song, poetry and patriotism—the name preferred is Columbia. This will be seen by our national anthems, such as "*Hail Columbia*," and the patriotic song, "*Columbia*," written by Timothy Dwight, while a chaplain in the Revolutionary Army, in 1777-78, commencing thus :

"Columbia, Columbia, to glory arise,
The Queen of the world and the child of the skies,"

and other national airs. In the nomenclature of American geography the name Columbia has also gained ground. An immense country in the northwestern portion of our continent is called British Columbia, and its great continental river is called the Columbia. So, too, one of the South American republics is called *The United States of Colombia*. The State of Ohio has named its capital Columbus, and the State of South Carolina has Columbia for its capital. The State of New York and six other states have Columbia counties, and many towns bear that name. When we became independent states, the principal seat of learning in the city of New York changed its name from King's College, which it had received from King George II., to that of Columbia College. And when our Fathers selected a site for the seat of the national government, they called it the District of Columbia, and by naming the national capital Washington, they appropriately linked together forever the names of Columbus and Washington.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

A RETROSPECT (*Continued*).

THE first part of this retrospect was terminated by various references to Augustus Welby Pugin, who was undoubtedly the great originator of the revival of ecclesiastical art, as it had existed in its greatest glory during the Middle Ages. The spirit he had set going entirely dominated Oscott at the time of my residence there, with the complete approval and active support of Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman.

The most significant symbol of this spirit was the large chasuble, which was used at Oscott, as it was also at the Cathedral of the Vicariate—St. Chad's, Birmingham. No one can deny that it is a far more graceful and dignified vestment than is the rigid garment of Italy and France, with its square lower border. Surely there can be few objects of ecclesiastical art more important than the eucharistic vestment of the priest who offers the greatest of all sacrifices, that of Holy Mass!

I recollect being near the High Altar of St. Peter's on Christmas Day, 1869, when Pius IX. sang High Mass during the Vatican Council. As he came from the altar he passed almost close to me, and it was impossible not to perceive how far more majestic and dignified must have been the appearance of the Pontiff's predecessors; such as Innocent III., or the Pope whose tomb fronts the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament at St. Peter's, his effigy bearing a chasuble with ample folds.

At the time of my stay at Oscott, the large chasuble was rapidly extending over the whole of England (where it still holds its own in the North and West), and was destined to spread in France, Belgium and Northern Germany.

That it did not extend into the South, is not wonderful in our day. There was a time when Italy justly held an acknowledged sway over Europe, in matters both of art and science; but that time has long passed away; and it is Northern Europe, and the nations which thence have sprung, which now really lead the van of civilization, in the domains of both science and art.

But even in Italy the large chasuble persisted much longer than is commonly supposed, and no authoritative decree or declaration was the cause of its curtailment. The Rev. Father Lockhart, of the Order of Charity and of St. Etheldreda's, London, has recently published a small work¹ to show this. Therein he points out how

¹ *The Chasuble, Its Form and Size*. London, Burns & Oates, 1891.

St. Charles Borromeo, the great restorer (under the authority of the Council of Trent), of ecclesiastical discipline, and of the solemnity of public worship, laid down as the minimum width of the chasuble the measure of "three cubits"—or somewhat more than sixty English inches—and directed that it should "hang over the arms, with one fold at least, below each shoulder. As regards the length of the chasuble, he distinctly said that it is to "reach nearly to the heels"—*pæne ad talos pertingat*. Father Lockhart concludes¹ that it is no real innovation, and requires no special permission, to make vestments of the size prescribed by St. Charles; and such are now made for and used in the Church of St. Etheldreda, in London.

But to return to our present retrospect:

The College of St. Mary's Oscott is situated in one of the most healthy regions in England. Even the great manufacturing city of Birmingham is (in spite of its smoky chimneys) quite exceptionally salubrious, so much so that an old gentleman, a connection of the 16th Earl of Shrewsbury, left the country and came to reside in that city for the benefit of his health. The remarkable healthiness of Birmingham is due to the great thickness of the red-sandstone formation on which it stands and which most effectually aids its excellent drainage.

But the country near Oscott was, in 1845, exceptionally attractive from its picturesqueness. Immediately adjacent was the widespread heather of "Sutton Coldfield," while close by were extensive woods—with ponds and streams—part of the old primeval forest of England which has since been cut down. This alas! has now lost its charm of wildness and has become a public park.

Amongst the divines and one or two senior students of uncertain future, a small society was formed for the regular daily recitation, in choir, of the whole of the divine office. Of this society the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer was the head. Mr. Renouf was also a member of it, and his private pupil then and there acquired a love for this liturgical worship which he has never lost. We occupied the stalls on either side of the sanctuary, and met in the forenoon to say Prime, Tierce, Sext and None; in the afternoon we assembled for vespers and compline, while after night prayers we recited the matins and lauds of the following day. The ceremonies of Holy Week were carried out at Oscott with great perfection, and people were in the habit of coming from considerable distances to witness them.

When Newman and his Oxford disciples, who had just been received into the Church, made their first appearance at Oscott,

¹ *Op. Cit.*, p. 19.

the humble unobtrusive demeanor of men so distinguished, made a strong impression on the minds of some of the lads. Amongst the smaller boys was little John Acton, whose duty it was to support Bishop Wiseman's train at great ceremonies. Now, as Lord Acton, he is known throughout the cultivated world. Another lad, whose beautiful soprano voice was the delight of our choir and congregation, has now for more than a quarter of a century been known at Rome first as Monsignor, of late as Archbishop, and probably will be soon saluted as "Cardinal" Stonor.

Dr. Wiseman's sympathies were strongly conservative, and lay with the Austrians in their domination of Italy, certainly not with the "Liberals" of that peninsula. On the death of Gregory the Sixteenth, news came to the Bishop of the election as Pope of Cardinal Ferretti. Great was his joy, and the boys were assembled to be informed of the good news—for that cardinal was a strong supporter of the Austrians and of the old ways. Alas! a little later he heard that the new Pope was Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, so well known for his liberalism that his predecessor had said: "In casa Mastai anche il gatto é liberale!"—"In the Mastai's house, even the cat is a liberal!"

Amongst the distinguished foreigners who visited Oscott, was Count Montalembert—then an ardent follower of the prince who subsequently would neither abdicate nor allow himself to be placed upon the French throne; and who practically completed the ruin of the dynasty which his grandfather (first as the Count d'Artois, and afterwards as Charles X.), did more than any other man in France to destroy.

We saw a good deal of the religious condition of France just before and just after the fall of Louis Phillippe. The unsympathetic attitude of that king to the Church, and the readiness of his government to commit slight acts of hostility to it, had ended by largely destroying the previously long-standing popular animosity to the "*partie-prêtre*"; and certainly when the republic was proclaimed, in 1848, there were no public demonstrations of hatred to the Church as there had been in the revolution of 1830. But to this subject we shall have occasion to return.

Meanwhile in England the Church grew and throve amazingly. Every year after that which witnessed Newman's submission saw a number of important converts added to its ranks. Newman, Oakley, Ward and the other High Church Anglican leaders were followed by members of other clergy whose names are less widely known, and ultimately by two whose influence has been profound. One of these was Mr. Henry William Wilberforce, Vicar of East Farleigh, in Kent, and son of the Rev. William Wilberforce, the friend of Pitt and a member of the House of Commons for more

than half a century. Henry Wilberforce was received into the Church in the chapel of the Jesuits at Brussels, on the 15th September, 1850, and was confirmed on the 21st by the Cardinal-archbishop of Malines, in the chapel of the seminary. He was impelled to enter the Church on account of a celebrated judgment in what was known as the "Gorham case," wherein it was decided that the question of baptismal regeneration was an open one in the Anglican Church.

The same cause produced a similar effect on the second of these converts to whom I have just referred—I mean Archbishop Manning, who became the new Archbishop of Westminster, and whose decease is now widely deplored in England.

During this prosperous time—between 1840 and 1850—the desire arose and spread to have once again a national hierarchy, in the place of the old government by vicars apostolic, under which the Catholic Church in England had prospered so greatly.

Petitions to this end were sent to Rome. In 1846, two bishops went to the Holy City to advocate the change, and in 1848, yet another was delegated to the Holy See with still more earnest petitions for an increase of bishops and the establishment of the hierarchy. The preliminary arrangements were indeed then concluded, when the troubles which befell the Roman States put a temporary stop to the execution of the plan. An understanding had, however, been arrived at with the English government, which appeared satisfied so long as no bishop was created with any of the titles then borne by members of the Anglican Episcopate.

Little did any one in England, lay or clerical, dream of the storm of fanaticism, the fever of intolerance, and above all the amazing stupidity which were to display themselves far and wide over the land when this change became known, and was stigmatized as the "*Papal aggression*." It was the last memorable outbreak of the "No Popery" spirit, and will ever have great historical interest. We who witnessed it can, through it, understand the bloody consequences of the similar movement (in less civilized times), initiated and carried on by the ever infamous Titus Oates, more than a hundred and fifty years before. The great figure which aroused and ultimately calmed this national turmoil was Cardinal Wiseman, of whom it may be useful here to put before our readers a few biographical details.

He was descended from an Irish family long resident in Spain, and was born at Seville, in 1802. He was therefore but forty-nine years old at the time of the "*Papal aggression*."

As a youth he was educated first at Ushaw, and afterwards in the English College at Rome, publishing, when but eighteen years old, a Latin work on Oriental languages. Subsequently he became

a professor in the Roman University, and afterwards Rector of the English College. In 1835, he returned to England, and in that year and the next preached several series of sermons which attracted great attention and admiration. Then he went to Rome, and in 1840 the number of English vicars apostolic was doubled, and Dr. Wiseman was appointed coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, of the central district. In 1847 he again went to Rome and he was made Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London district, in the place of Dr. Griffiths, deceased. Subsequently, Dr. Walsh was translated to London, and Dr. Wiseman made his coadjutor there, with the right of succession.

Dr. Wiseman was naturally fond of all that was stately, majestic and artistic, and he would have made an admirable cardinal of the age of the "Renaissance." His foreign education rendered it impossible to be thoroughly "in touch" with English ways and feelings, and he more than once aroused opposition and hostility by his very efforts to conciliate and please.

At last the hour came: the apostolical letter of Pius IX., signed by Cardinal Lambruschini, and dated the 29th September, 1850, appeared, and Dr., then Cardinal, Wiseman published his celebrated pastoral, some incautious expressions in which greatly excited the popular ire. We well recollect being in the Jesuits' church, at Farm street, and being ourselves struck by the style in which certain, really very simple facts, were announced to ignorant and unprepared ears. In his pastoral he declared: "At present, and till such time as the Holy See shall think fit otherwise to provide, *we govern, and shall continue to govern*,¹ the counties of Middlesex, Hertford and Essex *as ordinary thereof*, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, *as administrator with an ordinary jurisdiction*.

"Further, we have to announce to you that, as if still further to add solemnity and honor to this noble act of apostolic authority, and to give an additional mark of paternal benevolence towards the Catholics of England, his Holiness was pleased to raise us in the private consistory of Monday, the 30th of September, to the rank of Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church. And on the Thursday next ensuing, being the third day of this month of October, in public consistory, he delivered to us the insignia of this dignity, the cardinalitial hat, assigning us afterwards for our title in the private consistory which we attended, the Church of St. Pudentiana, in which St. Peter is generally believed to have enjoyed the hospitality of the noble and partly British family of the Senator Pudens.

¹ The italics are, of course, ours.

"In that same consistory we were enabled ourselves to ask for the Archiepiscopal Pallium, for our new See of Westminster; and this day we have been invested, by the hands of the Supreme Pastor and Pontiff himself, with the badge of *Metropolitan jurisdiction*.

"*This great work, then, is complete; what you have long desired and prayed for is granted; your beloved country has received a place among the fair Churches which form the splendid aggregate of Catholic Communion: Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had vanished, and begins now to show its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity. . . .*

"Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome, this seventh day of October, MDCCCL.

NICHOLAS,

Cardinal-archbishop of Westminster.

By command of His Eminence,

FRANCIS SEARLE, *Secretary.*"

It is frequently surprising to thoughtful persons how very often mere assertion suffices to produce belief. Incredible as it may seem, a multitude of persons in England then thought that the Pope's action, if not opposed by some special enactment, would alone suffice to make the ecclesiastical position of the new Cardinal *legal* and capable of being *enforced by law*. His assertion, therefore, that he "governed and would continue to govern" as "ordinary," or with "ordinary jurisdiction," produced real alarm—an alarm increased by the statement that "the great work was complete," and "England restored to its orbit round the centre of unity." The Cardinal distinctly asserted that a great change "long desired and prayed for," had been "completed." Ordinary persons, ignorant of matters Catholic, might, then, be pardoned for thinking this meant something more than that a mere modification in the relations of Catholics amongst themselves had taken place.

The Archbishop's stately and elaborate mode of reference to "the cardinalitial hat," and other personal details, ending with the notice about "the badge of Metropolitan jurisdiction," were not to English Protestant taste, and men's teeth were set on edge by the semi-royal "Given out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome," and the secretarial signature "by *command* of His Eminence."

But the effect produced by this somewhat injudicious pastoral was still further intensified by certain expressions in the apostolical letter signed by Cardinal Lambruschini.

The manner in which England appeared to be parcelled out in groups of counties, with seeming utter disregard to what county

authorities might say, was startling ; but certain expressions were more startling still.

Whether the established Church of England was "Catholic" or not, was a question which its members were accustomed to hear canvassed without vexation ; but no one had denied it its exclusive right to the title of "*the Anglican Church*." Yet the Pope says : "We shall continue to avail ourselves of the instrumentality of the said congregation (referring to Propaganda) in all things appertaining to the *Anglican Churches*."

He further adds a statement which many foolish persons thought meant immediate "dis-establishment and dis-endowment" of the State Church ; for Cardinal Lambruschini writes : "Whatever regulations, either in the ancient system of the Anglican Churches, or in the subsequent missionary state, may have been in force either by special institutions, or privileges, or peculiar customs, shall *henceforth carry no weight nor obligation* ; and in order that no doubt may remain on this point, we by the plenitude of our Apostolic authority, repeal and abrogate *all power whatsoever* of imposing obligations or conferring rights in those peculiar constitutions and privileges of whatever kind they may be, and in all customs by *whomsoever*, or at *whatever more ancient or immemorial time* brought in."

He also refers to "the rights and privileges of the ancient Sees of England" and declares that such (and other things in opposition to the new departure) "we expressly annul and repeal" and adds : "Moreover we decree that if, in *any other manner, any other attempt* shall be made by *any* persons, or by *any* authority to set aside these enactments, such attempt shall be null and void."

This seemed to some people a challenge indeed ; the storm quickly burst, and as every one in England and very many in America probably know, the signal for political action was given by a then minister, Lord John Russell in his celebrated "Durham letter."

That epistle to the Bishop of Durham is dated November 4th, and in it occur the following passages :

"My dear Lord: I agree with you in considering the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as 'insolent and insidious,' and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject. . . . There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England and a claim to the whole and undivided sway, which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy. . . . There is however a danger which alarms me much more than any assertion of a foreign sovereign. Clergymen of our own Church,

who have subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks step by step to the very verge of the precipice. The honor paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the Cross, the muttering of the liturgy, so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution:—all these things are pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England. . . . I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their *insidious* course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of the nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavors which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.

“I remain with great respect, etc.,

J. RUSSELL.”

DOWNING STREET, Nov. 4th.

Thereupon followed a long succession of bishops' charges, addresses, petitions as absurd and as impotent in their results as the penal law which was subsequently enacted. There was an address to the Queen from the bishops of the Established Church, two others from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and one from the Lord Mayor and Corporation of the City or London. The civic dignities went down in great state to the Queen at Windsor Castle, the railway company which conveyed them from London having arranged to carry seventy private carriages and two hundred horses.

On arriving at Slough a procession was formed, when the Lord Mayor (preceded by his footmen in their state liveries, his household in their carriages and the City Marshal on horseback) rode in his state carriage, drawn by six horses and attended by his sword-bearer, and his chaplain with other functionaries. He was followed by the Aldermen and Sheriffs and the other members of the Corporation in their carriages.

After entering the castle they were received by the Queen seated in St. George's Hall surrounded by various of her ministers—amongst them Lord John Russell—lords and ladies in waiting, pages of honor, etc. Prince Albert received the address and presented it to the Queen. It contained the following passage:

“We learn with feelings of surprise and indignation that the Bishop of Rome has recently issued a bull, whereby he not only

presumes to partition this country into pretended dioceses of the Church of Rome, but at the same time assumes the right of appointing archbishops and bishops of such dioceses and conferring upon them territorial titles and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all which we deem to be inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution in Church and State, an invasion of your Majesty's royal supremacy, an audacious usurpation of your Majesty's prerogative of alone bestowing titles of honor, and a grievous insult to this Protestant nation. For remedy whereof we earnestly entreat that your Majesty will direct such measures to be taken as in your royal wisdom shall seem expedient, assuring your Majesty, that you may ever confidently rely on the affectionate and cordial support of a large, united and religious people."

In February, 1851, there was introduced into the House of Commons "a bill to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." Three hundred and ninety-five members voted for its introduction and only sixty-three against it. This bill which was shortly passed (and has only of late been repealed) contained, after a long preamble, the following "special clauses:"

"I. If, after the passing of this Act, any person other than a person thereunto authorized by law in respect of an archbishopric, bishopric or deanery of the United Church of England and Ireland assume or use the name, style or title of archbishop, bishop or dean of any city, town or place, or of any territory or district (under any designation or description whatsoever) in the United Kingdom, whether such city, town or place, or such territory or district, be or be not the see or the province, or co-extensive with the province, of any archbishop, in the see or the diocese, or co-extensive with the diocese of any bishop, in the seat or place of the Church of any dean, or co-extensive with any deanery, of the said United Church, the person so offending shall, for every such offense, forfeit and pay the sum of *one hundred pounds*."

"II. Any deed or writing made, signed or executed after the passing of this Act, by or under the authority of any person, in or under any name, style, or title which such person is by this Act prohibited from assuming or using, shall be void."

This *brutum fulmen* was passed hardly more than forty years ago; and when we view it in the light of the present public opinion which prevails in England it seems hardly credible that such ignorance of the first principles of religious freedom should have continued down to so late a date. To American readers it must seem a strange fact indeed.

But stranger still, it was not only Protestants who were scandalized at so really simple a matter as the rearrangement spontane-

ously made by Catholics of their own voluntary arrangements among themselves; but certain socially eminent and highly-placed Catholics were hardly less disturbed. Certain Catholic laymen attended a meeting in Yorkshire called by the high sheriff with respect to an address to the crown on the "papal *oppression*," and to it some noble lords and other eminent laymen gave their written adhesion.

Not long afterwards, as if to mark the appreciation of such opposition by the sovereign, the queen, with the prince consort, went to a distinguished nobleman's house where a special and most stately banquet was held, as is duly represented in the illustrated journal of that day.

The wonderful and widespread storm which arose so suddenly and resulted in acts so deplorable, fell with almost as much rapidity, being in great measure stilled by the ardent efforts of Cardinal Wiseman.

Soon peace returned and religious matters seemed to be settling down much as they were before the establishment of what was after all somewhat inappropriately termed the "hierarchy"; since the new organization consisted and still consists but of a true hierarchy's highest members. Little difference, however, was at first noticeable, at least to laymen. The bishops—notably the bishops of Birmingham, Northampton, Nottingham, Hereford and Hexham—were still zealous in seeking to demonstrate to High Church Protestants the real identity between the old Church of England as it was when Henry VIII. came to the throne and the organization just erected.

They seemed fully to realize how much men's minds are influenced by externals, and regulated their rules and actions in this respect at once by the dictates of the scholastic philosophy and the ever memorable injunction of Gregory the Great to St. Augustine to make use of what was local and national for the benefit of what was universal and catholic. Little by little, however, the stream of conversion shrank. Certainly the number of distinguished Anglican ecclesiastics who submitted became annually less, and it was abundantly clear that the hopes of those who looked forward to a speedy *conversion* of England were terribly mistaken. Meanwhile, not only did the Catholic movement diminish, but the Anglican Church began to gain strength more and more as soon as the shock of the conversions of Wilberforce and Manning had finally come to an end.

Meantime a new tendency began to gain prominence in the Catholic Church in England, *pari passu* with the great reaction in France, which was following upon Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*.

During the republic which began in 1848, that very influential, and, as I believe, fatally influential journalist, Louis Veuillot, wrote in the most ultra democratic vein.

His well-known organ, *L'Univers*, adopted and defended the strongest opinions of the school, far beyond what was necessary to maintain the ecclesiastical liberty which the second republic had rather welcomed than merely tolerated after the fall of Louis Philippe. But no sooner had the *coup d'état* been effected and the prince-president shown his inclination to acquire the support of churchmen for his despotism, than Veuillot completely changed his policy and became the advocate of absolutism. Not a few ecclesiastics and some prominent laymen followed him and openly renounced those principles of moderate liberty, so prized in England and America, hailing enthusiastically the new Cæsar.

Thereupon once more followed consequences similar to those which had resulted from the alliance of the altar with the throne under the Restoration.

The Church had then been widely detested; under the disfavor of the citizen king it had regained popularity, which was augmented under the republic. As allied with the Emperor Napoleon III., its unpopularity speedily returned. We well recollect meeting at Bruges some Frenchmen who had been driven away through fear of the consequences of the *coup d'état*. Addressing us as an English Catholic, they said: "Sir, we assure you we honestly approved of the liberty the Church had gained, and desired to maintain it on the basis of liberty and freedom for all citizens. But *now*, after the principles firmly professed have been thus repudiated, when favors and wealth have been accepted from hands red with the blood of citizens slain so that he might attain a throne, only to be gained by murder as well as perjury; *now*, when we return, we will allow such liberty no longer; monks shall be expelled, churches shall be closed, and Catholics will rue the day when they became false to the freedom they had hypocritically affected to favor."

It is not for us to judge the excuses offered for acts thus complained of; but the unhappy results of those acts are indeed too plainly to be seen to-day, and much do we fear that only after much suffering and persecution, if ever, will the *Church in France* regain the averted sympathies of the effective part of the nation.

During this very time arose into prominence that new tendency amongst the Catholic clergy of England to which we have alluded—a tendency to popular Italian devotions. This was greatly promoted by Newman and Faber when they joined the Oratorians and initiated a special devotion to St. Philip Neri and a practical preference for saints of the post-mediæval period. The spirit which animated the Oratories of Birmingham and London were, however, not identical. The latter, under Father Faber, appeared more conspicuously Italian, and began a series of lives of the saints which

aroused much antagonism and was ultimately stopped. The practice of reciting and singing Latin in the Italian mode, which was previously very rare, became much more common, and a desire increased to have churches and church ornaments, vestments and sacred vessels no longer in the style of the Church in England as it was, but in that of the Church in Italy as it is.

It has been the constant Catholic practice to conciliate different nations in various ways, and the illustrious Pontiff, now happily reigning, has notably sought to conciliate races of Eastern Rites. It is surely a common-sense policy to develop points of contact, to conciliate national feelings so far as this can be done without sacrificing principles, and above all to avoid setting men's backs up by needless opposition in matters unessential.

The illustrious first Archbishop of Westminster, during the fourteen years he occupied the see, lived down all violent opposition and much prejudice. We saw him cordially received and heartily applauded at the Royal Institution where he once lectured on "Science and Art." Yet he never gained a wide welcome in English society outside the Catholic Church, and the last years of his life were chiefly passed in retirement at his country house in Essex.

He felt very keenly the anxiety and distress, in which all Catholics participated, on the declaration of war between France and Austria, in 1859, the first decisive step in the overthrow of the Pope's civil principedom. We had been impressed, years before, by the words of Cardinal Pacca as to the probability that in the order of God's providence that principedom was destined to come to a speedy end; and we were, therefore, very anxious that this probability should not be so unappreciated by Catholics as to lead them to neglect the requisite pecuniary provisions for such an eventuality.

It seemed to us, and to one or two friends with whom we spoke, that the time had come for an attempt to restore the ancient tribute of Peter's Pence to the Holy See.

We obtained for this purpose the hearty concurrence of Sir George Bowyer,—then George Bowyer, Esq., M.P.,—and the following hand-bill was circulated towards the end of the year 1859:

"You are requested to attend with your Catholic friends, a Meeting which will be held on Tuesday, November 20th, at 8 P.M., at the Hanover Square Rooms, for the promotion of a St. Peter's Pence Association. George Bowyer, Esq., M.P., in the Chair."

About three hundred persons attended the meeting; but in consequence of a communication received through Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, from the Cardinal Secretary of State, a change was made as to the name of the association. The Cardinal Secretary

said that although the Holy Father was not in want at present of the offerings of the faithful, he much desired an expression of their sympathy. Accordingly, the title was changed from "The St. Peter's Pence Association" to that of "The S.S. Peter and Paul Association"; and at a meeting held nine days later the following resolutions were passed:

"I. That the S.S. Peter and Paul Association be formed to collect names for an address to the Holy Father, and to promote by every means dutiful and affectionate veneration for his sacred office and person; and also to be ready, at such times as circumstances may render it useful, to collect offerings in aid of the Holy Father, and the Association consist of members each undertaking to promote the object of the Association under the direction of the Upper Committee.

"II. That the Association have its members organized in Local Committees, to be formed in every parish, and meetings once a month to discuss the interests of the Association.

"III. That for the same purpose, in every town or district when Local Committees are sufficiently near to each other, a Special Committee be formed, consisting of two members for each Local Committee of the town or district, and meeting once every three months at least.

"IV. That the Special Committee of London act as an Upper Committee, to correspond with all the committees in England and with any general direction of the Association which may be established; and that, before beginning its operations, every committee obtain the sanction of the Upper Committee and receive the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities.

"V. That Messrs. George Bowyer, M.P., St. George Mivart, Samuel J. Nicholl, Archibald J. Dunn, Thomas Egan, and George J. Wigley act as Provisional Committee of the Association, with power to add to their number."

An address to His Holiness was forwarded by the Provisional Committee on January 1, 1866, and a request was in the meantime issued by the Holy Father that the faithful *should* come in aid to the treasury of the Pontifical Government in its struggle against the enemies of religion throughout Europe; and accordingly, on January 12th, a circular was issued by the president, and Messrs. Wigley and Nicholl, Honorary Secretaries, immediately instituted collections by the Association of weekly pence throughout the country; and thus it was that three and thirty years ago Peter's Pence came once more to be collected in England.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

THE FRIARS OF THE WEST INDIES.

WILL the friars and their work in the New World be properly represented, either at Chicago, Genoa, Madrid, Huelva, or wherever else the festivities of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America are going to be celebrated?

Will the religious orders, whether Franciscans or Dominicans, Augustinians or Jesuits, receive the credit which belongs to them in the work of civilizing the newly-discovered countries from the banks of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of La Plata?

Will friars and monks and monastic institutions be commemorated at those quadri-centennial displays, such as they have been in the New World—not only as pioneers and missionaries, but as strong elements of civilization, indefatigable educators of the people, strenuous opponents of oppression, and undaunted advocates of liberty and justice?

The work of the monks in Europe, wonderful as it is for magnitude, variety, and utmost importance in every respect, differs in many things from their work in America. In Europe the monastic orders had to save, and did save, all that could be saved, of the structure of ancient civilization, wrecked and demolished by the irresistible wave of barbarism. They had, besides, to clear, as they did clear, almost the whole area of central and northern Europe, and deliver, as they did, to agriculture what thus far had been covered with impenetrable forests, or consisted principally of impassable swamps and marshes. They had to copy manuscripts; to preserve the writings of the philosophers, orators, poets, historians, scientists, etc., who had flourished before the invasion of the northern barbarians, and which were hidden among the ruins of the Roman Empire; to cultivate the lands; to make roads and bridges;¹ they had to keep inns or hotels along the roads in order to give hospitality to the wayfarer; they had to perform police duties on the highways and on the sea, as in the case of the military orders; they had to do, in fine, many other things, independent of their own religious duties and general work of charity, which the peculiar circumstances of the times and localities had rendered necessary.

In Spain, to which when speaking of the New World we have to turn our eyes with all deference, the work of monks and mo-

¹ There was an order especially established for this purpose, the Bridge-builder Brothers—*Fratres Pontifices*.

nastic institutions had to be, and it was, especially diversified. "To the monks," says Doctor Don Francisco Martinez Marina,¹ "the Spanish nation owes not only the preservation of agriculture, but innumerable precious documents, chronicles, and materials for her history, without which very little or nothing could now be known of the important events of those days. They also occupied themselves in copying books, deeds, decisions of the councils, collections of old laws, whether secular or ecclesiastical, and in many other labors of the same character and importance. Spain owes to Vigila and his disciples, Sarracino and Garcia, monks at Alvela, in 976, the famous 'Vigilanus Codex,' also called 'Alveldensis.' She owes, also, to Velasco and his disciple, Sisebrito, the not less celebrated 'Emilianensis Codex,' now preserved at San Millan de la Cogulla. Both works are very well known in the history of Spanish literature, and are entitled to the great celebrity which they enjoy in the world of letters."

The same learned author says: "The convents of Spain were asylums of religion, piety, learning, and public instruction, even in the most calamitous times. It is well known that the schools were in the cathedrals and in the convents. All the books of the time, and all records, either of private transactions or of public acts, were kept and preserved in the cloisters and in the sacristies. The abstemious and laborious life of the monks allowed them to have always at hand abundant means to attend to the necessities of the poor and to exercise the virtue of hospitality. They spent their time in teaching, in preaching, in writing, in copying all kinds of books, in tilling the fields and otherwise promoting agriculture, which at that time, owing to the general unsettled condition of things, and the state of almost perpetual war, was a pursuit in which only monks could engage with any kind of safety as well as perseverance and intelligence. To them, and to them only, it was due that a most extensive portion of the face of the world should cease to be a wilderness. They, especially the lay brothers, who used to be numerous, cut down the trees, cleared away the bushes, improved the ground, dug ditches and canals whenever necessary, built dams across the rivers, and acted with such energy that, in comparatively short time, they succeeded in converting entire regions abandoned and unsettled, absolutely impenetrable in some places, fit only to be, as they were, the domicile of wild beasts, into fertile lands, fruitful fields, smiling meadows, and luxuriant orchards and groves."

In addition to all this work, physical, intellectual, moral, and

¹ *Ensayo Historico Critico sobre la Legislacion y Principales Cuerpos Legales de los Reinos de Leon y Castilla*. Madrid. 1834. (Critical and Historical Essay on the Legislation and Principal Collections of Laws of the Kingdoms of Leon and Castile.)

religious, the Spanish monks were called to perform, owing to the necessities of the times in their country, and therefore to an extent perhaps greater than their brethren anywhere else, the duty attended with more difficulties and dangers than at any other subsequent time, of protecting the lives of pilgrims, and travellers generally, and attending to their comfort and welfare. Through those admirable organizations, so full of interest and romance, known to history under the name of Spanish Military Orders, namely, the Knights of Alcantara, Montesa, Santiago, and San Juan de Jerusalem—strange combinations of monasticism and chivalry, standing monuments of the pliability and adaptability of Catholic faith to all the necessities of society—such services were rendered in this line as to make their remembrance eternal. Besides ensuring, by their presence, the lives of the travellers, as well as the property of travellers, those knight-brothers had hospitals and inns where shelter and attention were given to all who needed it; and in this way, while performing a work of charity, and fulfilling a moral and religious duty, they also promoted trade between the different sections of the country, and contributed to increase the national wealth and prosperity.

Nor was this wonderful work of the religious orders confined to the land alone. The noble orders which, under the invocation of *Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, were founded by Pedro Nolasco and Juan de Mata for the redemption of captives—as well as the knights of Malta and others—performed the same duty on the high seas, and more especially on the Mediterranean. While the well-equipped and always dreaded galleys of those orders kept the pirates at safe distance, or punished their boldness, when the occasion presented itself, the knight-fathers of La Merced attended on their part to the ransom of the captives made by the same pirates and their restitution to their homes. The United States of America owe to one branch of this order, which was established in Paris in the latter part of the last century, the freedom of no less than two hundred of their citizens, who had languished in captivity under the Dey of Algiers, from 1785 to 1795.¹

In America, owing to her own peculiar conditions, and to the epoch of her discovery, the religious orders were not called to do all the work which they had done elsewhere, or to do it through the same channels and methods. They had before them a large and vast field, but this field in most respects was exclusively American. They had to encounter difficulties and evils, which at

¹ The writer of this paper had the pleasure and the honor to publish an article on this subject in the number of September 22, 1883, of the *Washington Catholic*, under the title of "The Mathurin Fathers: A Chapter of American History."

least in their own especial form had never at any time before presented themselves. They had no classical literature to save, or to restore. They had not to infuse new life into a civilization, otherwise magnificent, but which had been prostrated by its vices, nor were they called to moderate and smooth the fury of the barbarians. But they had to deal with the *mita*¹ and with the *repartimientos*² and with many other abominations which the Spaniards invented in the New World. They had to deal with men of iron, bold, uneducated, tyrannical beyond description, and who on account of the distance from the mother country, and the peculiar circumstances in which they found themselves, were almost all-powerful. They had also to undertake, even within the limits of the purely missionary work, a task of extreme difficulty and unprecedented hardship, with tribes and nations of various customs and languages, always under the spur of tyranny, and hating in most cases, and with abundant reason, all that came from Spain.³ But they were equal to their task: they saw at once all the difficulties and responsibilities which the circumstances of the times and places devolved upon them; they grasped the situation fully, and recognized without difficulty what Divine Providence demanded from them. And although most of the work which they had to do was new and unexpected, and had peculiar difficulties and drawbacks, they did it so well, and so nobly, and so courageously, as to excite our unbounded admiration and praise, even if considered only in the light of those standards most commonly accepted in the present days.

¹ Under the institution called "The Mita," every Indian, under fifty years of age and above eighteen, was compelled to do service in the mines, without more compensation than fifty cents a day. Each district had to furnish, according to its population, a certain number of *mitayos*, who were taken to the different mining localities, and were there distributed among the miners by the authorities. They had to leave their families, and to abandon at once all hope of freedom, or relief. Father Acosta, one of the most reliable and celebrated historians of South America, states that out of each five Indians, impressed in this way by the *Mita*, four invariably perished in the first year of their service. The fact is, and nobody can doubt its authenticity, that the *Mita* killed eight millions of Indians in Peru alone. Viceroy Marquis of Cañete, in the preface of his ordinance to regulate the work at the mines, states that these unfortunate creatures were often compelled "to work the twenty-four hours, without eating or sleeping,"—and Viceroy Don Luis Velasco, his successor, directed the mining work to be made "from sunrise to sunset," *de sol à sol*, "with two hours of rest between both limits."

² The *Repartimientos* were the distributions of Indians among the Spanish colonists and settlers, for the cultivation of their lands, the working of their mines, or even their simple domestic service. They were another form of slavery, against which the religious orders, especially the Dominicans, struggled unrelentingly and uncompromisingly.

³ Many instances are recorded in the history of those days in America of Indians refusing baptism for the express purpose of avoiding going to heaven, lest they might again meet with their heartless oppressors. (See Father Coll's *Colon and La Rabida*, page 294).

Will the quadri-centennial celebrations of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus pay, in the proper measure and with the magnificence becoming to its magnitude, the debt of gratitude which America owes to the monastic orders? Will they give the place of honor which is due to them, to those humble Franciscans, who established the first school in America; or to those learned Dominicans, who established Universities and centres of learning wherever they went, and who, better than that, never hesitated to raise their voices against despotic governors and heartless conquerors, and to defend the oppressed natives, without a particle of fear, and without admitting truce or compromise; or to those skillful physicians, sons of St. John of God, who studied medicine and founded hospitals, and attended the sick gratuitously, and restored to the dignity of the ministerial or sacerdotal character which belongs to it a profession which among the Romans was exercised by slaves, and which now, here, in the midst of so much boasted progress, is little less in many cases than a mere mercenary trade; or to those Mathurin Fathers, through whose action in the latter part of the last century, as has been said, so many American citizens were restored to liberty?

Jubilees and periodical celebrations of events of recognized importance, are not modern inventions. Man and his concerns are so ephemeral, and the necessity for him to pay a hearty tribute of thanksgiving for all that involves the idea of preservation, is so clearly impressed on his mind, that festivities of this kind have always been in use. And if, recently, the said festivities, centennials especially, have become fashionable, and so frequent indeed as to render their enumeration difficult, no well-disposed mind can be brought to object to them.

Much less objection could, under any circumstances, be made to the present Columbian celebrations, because of the immense importance of the event for the commemoration of which they are intended. Although Columbus never dreamed of the existence of the New World which he discovered, and although he never intended anything else than to find a new route to the East Indies, which was the great commercial problem of his age, especially after Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks in 1453, there is not the slightest doubt that the discovery of America marked an entirely new era in the life of the human race, and has to be considered, as most historians do consider it, the clearest and greatest landmark between the Middle Ages and what are called Modern Times.

Hence, when the prelate who now graces the arch-episcopal throne of Genoa informed our Holy Father the Pope that the authorities of that city,—one of the many which claim the honor

of being the native place of the illustrious discoverer, now exalted everywhere as an immortal genius, but when living and when offering his services to the proud republic, looked upon as no more than a "sailor in rags who promised worlds," *nudo nocchier promettitor di mondi*,—had come to the conclusion of celebrating with unusual pomp the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Columbus in the New World, the answer of Leo XIII., approving of the project and giving to it his sanction, was prompt and emphatic.

Our great Pontiff said in his reply, January 10, 1891, that the idea of making the said celebration was in all respects worthy of praise, but that particular care should be taken to cause the festivities to be perfectly in keeping with the character of Columbus and with the genuine spirit which animated him.

Columbus, above all, was a fervent, sincere Catholic. He was a member of the third order of St. Francis, and, according to the testimony of Bartolomé de las Casas, who knew him personally, "he frequently walked about dressed as a Capuchin." Anything, therefore, which might be said or done in his honor, if inconsistent with that religious spirit or at variance with it, would be entirely inappropriate.

"Whosoever should look," says the Holy Father, "only to the material consequences of the discoveries of Columbus and to their temporal results, and pay them no more honors than those to be bestowed upon things which have nothing to do with Catholic faith, or are brilliant for no other reason than the genius or the perseverance of those who carried them to success, would do great injustice to the name and to the memory of the illustrious navigator. . . . We hope that this solemnity, as well as the example of Columbus himself, will prove instrumental in inflaming the minds of great numbers of people, and inducing them to make efforts to extend upon earth the kingdom of Christ."

Even without the authority of this explicit declaration of the Holy Father, the assertion can be made confidently that a celebration of the discovery of America, and a display or exhibit of American civilization, in which the work of the Catholic Church does not appear prominently represented and towering supreme above all other elements of social life, would be sadly defective and unworthy of the occasion. And if, as witnessed by the words of the Pope, no commemoration of Columbus and of his deeds can ever approach completion or truth, if the Church and her action and her influence are not made the principal feature of the festivities with which it will be solemnized, their inadequacy and deficiency will be still greater if the religious orders—those monks and friars, now so despised and persecuted wherever the Spanish

language is spoken and the so-called "liberal spirit" prevails—are not given the very first place of honor.

No student of history or lover of the human race, no matter what prejudices he may have imbibed against Catholic institutions and ideas, can fail to recognize the immense courage, the incredible self-denial and the beneficial action in America of that noble democratic militia of the Church, which so tirelessly and so unrelentingly interposed itself at all times between the oppressed natives and their heartless oppressors, and which did so much, and so bravely and so persistently, for the education and the welfare of the people among whom it was thrown. The history of the work of those friars in the New World, principally the Franciscans and the Dominicans, has not been written as yet, probably because it requires, besides the gifts of a Montalembert, a Chateaubriand, or a Joseph de Maistre, additional qualifications of thorough acquaintance with local facts, but, when written, it will be, we venture to say it, without the slightest hesitation, the greatest and the noblest monument which can ever be raised in honor of mankind.

From the very first days of the arrival of Columbus in the New World,¹ up to the period in the present century in which at the hypocritical cries of "reform and liberty," "equality and fraternity," the religious orders were swept away, as if by a furious hurricane, from the soil of Spain and Spanish America, in all about three centuries and a half,—monastic institutions and monastic influence formed in the Spanish empire, on both sides of the Atlantic, the broadest and perhaps the firmest and most substantial basis of the social structure.

¹ Father José Coll, a learned member of the order of St. Francis, maintains, in an interesting book just published at Madrid under the title of *Colón y la Rabida* (Columbus and La Rabida), that Columbus was accompanied in his first voyage by Franciscan fathers.

He also maintains, and seems to have proved beyond doubt, that Father Bernard Boil, or Boyle, or Buil, whom Pope Alexander VI., on June 25, 1493, appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Western Indies, was not a Benedictine, as generally believed, but a Franciscan friar. And he shows also by documents and arguments which admit of no contradiction, that Father Antonio Marchena, of the same Franciscan order, and two Franciscan lay brothers named Fr. Juan de la Duella, or Deledeulle, a Frenchman by birth, and Fr. Juan de Tisin, accompanied Columbus and Father Boyle and eight other Franciscan friars in his second voyage.

It is curious to see how historians and writers have succeeded in turning into one and the same person, under the name of Fray Juan Perez de Marchena, two entirely different individuals, Fray Juan Perez, the Superior of La Rabida, and Fray Antonio Marchena, a learned Franciscan, conversant with astronomy, both friends of Columbus.

Nor is it less interesting to contemplate how many efforts have been made to create two Fathers Boyle, one a Benedictine and another a Franciscan, when the words of the papal commission, *dilecto filio Bernardo Boil, Ordinis Minorum*, ought to have settled the question.

Those friars, so often represented in our days, in the countries of Spanish origin, as an obstacle to progress, as the most earnest advocates of ignorance and abject submission, as the worst enemies of the people, have been nevertheless the first, in the order of time, and the most assiduous, if not the only ones, in all periods of history, in the work of educating the masses, of promoting science and literature, of struggling against unscrupulous governors and tyrants of all kinds and grades, of conquering oppression and of vindicating the rights of justice and liberty.

The fact cannot be denied, for instance, that the very first school,—a primary gratuitous school,—ever opened on the soil of the New World, was opened by a Franciscan friar, Fray Pedro de Sante, or, as others call him, de Sanda, who was a relative of Emperor Charles V., and had accompanied Cortés in his expedition to Mexico. He and Fray Juan de Tecto, and Fray Juan de Ayora, belonging also to the Seraphic order, were the first ecclesiastics, who ever set their feet on the Mexican territory.

In a letter written by Fray Pedro de Sante, to the Emperor, in 1523, he said: "I have undertaken to teach the children to read and write, and also to sing, . . . and in order to do so, a school house has been built on the grounds surrounding our house, with sufficient capacity to accommodate from five hundred to six hundred children, who meet there daily."

Eight years afterwards (1531) that very same friar established another school for girls of noble birth, whether natives (*de caciques*) or of mixed race.

He also, aided no doubt by his companions, established a hospital, an account of which he gave to the Emperor in the following words: "Near our house an infirmary has been founded for the benefit of the natives, . . . and this is of great assistance to us for their conversion to the Faith, because they see the charity which Christians are capable of practising, and are therefore incited to be converted, and to love us and talk with us."

Not contenting himself with teaching the ignorant, and attending the sick, he never suffered any opportunity to pass without urging the Emperor to apply a remedy to the evils which afflicted the natives, who were treated, as he said, "worse than if they were dogs." "For the love of God," he says in one of his letters, "may your Majesty be pleased to provide, that no one of these natives be reduced to slavery by any person, of whatever rank or condition. Command that this slavery cease, and that these people be allowed to be Christians; because even on Christmas day they are compelled to work."

Several years later the same friar wrote: "I have worked with the Indians day and night for more than thirty years, and I have

been with them constantly in a school near this chapel (St. Joseph, the first church ever built in Mexico), and I have taught them to sing and to play on some instrument, and to read and write, and the Christian doctrine, and I have always had them at my charge, and have taken particular care of them."

And this venerable and humble Franciscan friar, educator, benefactor and tribune, is no more than a prominent specimen of what all his collaborators as well of his own order, as of the other orders, always did in America. They were the only representatives in the new countries of the idea of justice, and appeared in all respects as the principal factors in the moral, intellectual, and social development of the aborigines.

When describing the work of destruction which Spain allowed to go on at the convent of La Rábida, so intimately connected with Columbus and the discovery of America, the Rev. Father Coll, who has been mentioned before, alludes to a palm tree, which now stands alone on these grounds, once so celebrated for their beauty and magnificence,¹ but now barren and deserted. He says that that tall tree, the only extant monument of a glory past beyond hope and beyond recovery, soars up to heaven, as if in search of a purer air, or as if anxious to refuse the sweetness of its fruits to the ingratitude of men. In imitation of this beautiful figure, and even at the risk of repetition, because the truth can never be repeated too often, the assertion can be made and reiterated confidently, that nothing to be done either at Genoa, or at Madrid, Chicago, or elsewhere, can properly illustrate the history of the civilization of Spanish America, if a monument towering above the other monuments of the exhibition, even as the palm tree of La Rábida towers above the desert which now surrounds it, is not raised in commemoration of the religious orders, in recognition of their services, and in expiation of the grave crimes which have been committed against them.

Few indications can be found, however, in these days of the "secularization" of all things (marriage included), that such a tribute of respect, no matter how just and due, will be paid. The probabilities are, on the contrary, that the friars will never once be mentioned in connection with Columbus and the civilization of the New World, without applying to them, as the most natural of

¹ "It is a shame to think of what has passed at La Rábida during the last half century. When the Franciscan fathers were forced to leave it, under the laws which suppressed the monastic orders, and expelled their members, the convent and the Church of La Rábida were allowed to be plundered. The archives and the library were pillaged. The tiles and the timber of the roof, the doors and the windows, even the bricks of the partitions and pavements, were torn down and carried away. The extensive orchards, and all the robust and splendid trees, which surrounded the convent, were made to disappear."—*Colón y la Rábida*, pp. 66, 67.

epithets, the adjective "superstitious," or without making against them the unfounded charges which brought upon them obloquy and persecution. It will not be surprising if some enraged "liberal," imitating the Yucatan orator who proclaimed in the Mexican Congress that "the smoke of the convent fire-places obscures the sun of liberty," may come and display his bitter opposition to the religious orders;—nor will it be impossible, either, that other statesmen, deeming themselves to abound in benevolence and impartiality, may adopt a middle course and maintain that friars and convents, although a thing of the past, inconsistent with the enlightenment of our times, had nevertheless their day, in which they did some good.

Not many years ago (1885) a book, which owing to the especial circumstances in which its author happened then to be found, obtained an immense circulation (in this country at least), described the venerable members of the religious orders in the following language: "The humble monk, with bowed head enveloped in sombre cowl, his scanty gown dyed and stiffened by reason of his abstinence from the sinful luxury of ablution; his body girt with a heavy rope, by way of showing that the beast was well in hand monastic aristocrats bound together by voluntary obedience to a set of rules involving renunciation of the world . . . seeking to expiate former action by present lethargy, striving toward actual paralysis of all faculties which can connect the individual with the society."¹

If such a sturdy calumny as this can be uttered without the slightest provocation or foundation by a member of what the world has agreed to call the gentler sex, and in a country like this where the risk of endangering the Catholic vote is so keenly felt, and where full liberty of conscience and of expression allows truth to assert itself without difficulty, what shall we not hear from Freemasons of the 33d degree, either here or in Europe, or from other "unprejudiced and liberal-minded statesmen" on both sides of the Atlantic, in opposition to the idea of making Catholic monasticism the most prominent and the most honored feature of all festivities in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Columbus in the New World?

It is unnecessary for the readers of this paper to be reminded of the severe and cruel persecution to which the religious houses have been subjected in Spain and all the countries of Spanish origin ever since 1837. That very same convent of La Rabida, a fac simile of which is to be built at Chicago on the grounds of the Columbian World's Fair, that convent which Spain ought to have

¹ George Elliot's *Poetry and Other Studies*, by Rose Elizabeth Cleveland. New York—London. 1886. Essay entitled "The Monastery," pp. 129, 130.

preserved for all time as a superb monument of national glory, only escaped demolition by a bold act of disobedience on the part of the local governor of Huelva. This official took upon himself not to comply with the royal order of August 5, 1851, by which he was directed to pull down the building and sell the material, and was bold enough to remonstrate against the royal commandment. "If we hurry so much," said that brave official in his representation to the government of Madrid, "in demolishing and obliterating these landmarks of our history, public opinion and history herself will take cognizance of our acts and deliver them justly to the reprobation of both foreigners and Spaniards."

This noble deed, supplemented by the timely arrival upon the spot of a French prince, the Duke of Montpensier, with his wife, the queen's sister, and with his mother, the widow of Louis Philippe of France, saved the famous house. The illustrious visitors started a subscription for the restoration of these venerable ruins, which they could not view without emotion; and their success was so complete, that on the 15th of April, 1855, they could attend in that church the solemn high mass with which the restoration was solemnized.

But apart from the persecutions, which have been frequent, the fact will remain, that while the name of Columbus will be hailed and extolled in all possible tones—a little too late, perhaps—and while the magnitude and far-reaching importance of his achievement will be lauded and proclaimed in divers ways, little will be said, and that little possibly disparagingly, of the fraternal society of Saint Francis, to the Third Order of which the great navigator belonged, and that the Dominicans will be mentioned, only, if mentioned at all, as apostles of intolerance and religious persecution. Jews, Freemasons and freethinkers, who now prevail in the councils of government in the so-called Latin nations of the world, have no sympathy, undoubtedly, with the spirit and the work of the religious orders.

We may be sure that we shall listen to a great number of passionate outbursts of rhetoric, and contemplate not a small display of self-glorification, ill disguised under the name of patriotism, and intended to make up for centuries of oblivion and ingratitude; but while wealth and power and all the creations of science and art, and all the elements of material civilization will be called into requisition to make this somewhat tardy recognition brilliant, the humble men who encouraged the great sailor, and were so efficiently instrumental in the work he accomplished for the glory of God and the benefit of mankind, and who afterwards opened schools, and founded universities, and established hospitals, and

¹ *Colón and La Rabida*, p. 71.

heroically defended the natives, and indelibly impressed their religious character on the civilization of Spanish America, will be either forgotten entirely or given a place in accordance with the anti-religious spirit which is now prevailing.

Were it not for these circumstances and others which are nearly related to them, it would be scarcely comprehensible that the really hearty and spontaneous¹ commemoration of the discovery of the New World should be made in these United States, the American nation which, least of all, has had immediate relations with Columbus and his voyages, and which has had the least share in the ideas and principles which actuated the illustrious Genoese, a nation in which the Spanish element has ever been comparatively insignificant, and where Catholicity, although flourishing and always on the increase, is still in the minority.

The sons of St. Francis of Assisi were the first ecclesiastics who came to the New World. According to the "General Chronicle of the Order of Our Father St. Francis" (*Chronica general de la Orden de Nuestro Padre San Francisco*), "Seraphic Tree" (*Arbol Seráfico*), printed in Barcelona in 1703, the work of Father Gonzaga, "*De origine Seraphicæ Religionis Franciscanæ*," the "True Treasures of the Indies" (*Tesoros verdaderos de las Indias*), printed in Rome in 1681, and many other authorities quoted by Father Coll, Franciscan friars came with Columbus when (these are the *ipsissima verba* of the "Chronicle")² "Columbus embarked on the 3d of August, 1492." But even if, as contended by some, no ecclesiastic, whether regular or secular, came with him on his first voyage, no doubt can be entertained that ecclesiastics accompanied him on the second, and that the Franciscans were the first who exercised in the West Indies the functions of the Apostolate, the first who built a church in the New World³ and had a con-

¹ Father Coll, who wrote in 1891, while acknowledging that "the Spanish government had an ocean of projects for the celebration of the quadri-centennial," . . . complains that "three long years had been allowed to pass without having reached as yet any practical result." He says: "We are told day after day that these projects will be carried out; but we know well enough how much reliance is to be put on words, and until we see them substantiated by subsequent facts, we shall be unable to bestow much credence upon them."—*Colón y la Rábida*, page 82.

² Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, page 220.

³ "Soon after Columbus had taken possession of the island (Santo Domingo, or La Española), Fray Juan Perez, who came with Columbus and had done so much in furtherance of his projects, and was the first priest who arrived here (*Joannes Piretius primo in istam insulam ingressus*), built a cabin, which he roofed with branches of trees, where he said Mass and deposited the Blessed Sacrament; hence this was the first church built in the Western Indies: *et hæc prima Occidentalium omnium Indiarum ecclesia est*."—*Crónica General de la Orden*, etc. Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, pp. 220, 236, etc.

vent,¹ and a duly constituted province,² and that the first Bishop on this side of the Atlantic belonged to their order.³

The popularity of the sons of Saint Francis in the newly-discovered countries grew to such an extent and with such rapidity as to cause the Catholic kings, in spite of their piety, and of the general feeling of the period, to put some check to it. King Ferdinand, in 1506, issued a decree by which he forbade any new convent of St. Francis to be established in America, unless at a distance of at least five leagues (fifteen miles) from one already in existence.

The charge has often been ignorantly made against the Franciscan friars of having done nothing, or very little, in favor of science and intellectual development. No better answer could be given to this slander than by pointing to a book, printed in Tuscany, in the city of Prado, in 1888, under the title of "An Attempt towards a Franciscan Bibliography on Geographical, Historical and Ethnographical Subjects" (*Saggio di bibliografia geografica, storica, etnografica San Francescana*), by Father Marcellino da Civezza, of the same order. This admirable book is a catalogue, by order of authors, of all the writings on Geography, History and Ethnography, whose authors were Franciscan friars, and consists of more than 624 pages⁴ with over 750 names. They comprise books in Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, English, German, Turkish, Latin, Greek, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Siamese, and several languages of the American Indians⁵; and among them may be

¹ Columbus founded for the Franciscans their first convent in America, in the city of Santo Domingo, in 1493. Ovando completed it in 1502. *Cenobium autem . . . in civitate S. Dominici tumultuaria opera erectum, ac deinde à Christophoro Columbo firmiori Europæorum structura inchoatum, Ovandus absolvit.* (Wadding, *Annals of the Order of Saint Francis*).—Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, p. 240.

² The province of Santa Cruz, *Sanctæ Crucis in insulis*, was the name of this first religious province in the New World. It was created "on the eve of Pentecost, 1520," and Father Pedro de Mekia was the first provincial.—Father Coll, *Colón y la Rábida*, p. 258.

³ The episcopal See of Santo Domingo was created on the 8th of August, 1611, and Fray García de Padilla, a Franciscan, was appointed to fill it.

⁴ The number of pages is not given definitely because the copy which the writer of this paper has seen, sent to Mr. Wm. E. Curtis of this city (Washington) by Rev. Father Anacleto, O.S.F., of Boston, Mass., reaches only the name *Vega* (Fray Manuel de la Vega) on page 624. Father Vega's name is 750 in the catalogue.

⁵ There is a Spanish, Latin and Japanese Dictionary, by Fray Diego de Llagas,—a Japanese Grammar (in Spanish), by Father Rodriguez,—a Chinese and Spanish Dictionary, by Fray Miguel Rocca,—a Spanish, Latin and Arabic Dictionary, by Fray Francisco Cañat (edition of Madrid in 3 vols., 1787),—a Turkish Italian and Italian Turkish Dictionary, by Fray Arcangelo de Carradori, 1650,—a Chinese, French and Latin Dictionary, by Father Barile de Gemona, Paris, 1813,—a Spanish Siamese Dictionary, by Fray Francisco Hermona de San Buenaventura,—a Spanish Anamese Dictionary, by the same author,—a Dictionary of the Mexican language, by Fray Francisco de Salcedo,—a Dictionary of the language of Yucatan, by Fray Andres de

seen the famous letter of Fray Pedro de Ganda, or Gante, from San Francisco of Mexico, February 15, 1552, to the Emperor Charles V, "denouncing the lamentable condition to which the Indians had been reduced on account of the personal services required from them;" the not less remarkable communication of Fray Juan de Mansilla to King Phillip II, "making his majesty acquainted with the abuses which prevailed in Vera Cruz, and suggesting some remedy to the same," dated at Xalapa, May 24, 1562; the invaluable "Report submitted by Fray Carlos Delgado to Rev. Father Ximeno on the execrable tyranny exercised by the governors and *alcaldes mayores* against the Indians;" a manuscript in folio, now in the Royal Library at Madrid; the "Advertencias importantes" (Important Suggestions) of Fray Juan de Silva, addressed "to His Majesty and to the Council of the Indies, in 1631"; and many other books and pamphlets which will show that those humble servants of God had very much at heart the welfare of the people, and did not hesitate to raise their voices in their defence and in earnest condemnation of their oppressors of whatever rank or position.

The very same difficulties which Columbus himself had to encounter on the part of Father Boyle, and the other Franciscans who wrote against him to the Spanish Court prove the zeal of those friars on behalf of the people. Columbus, with all his merits, and with all his virtues, was no more than a man, and a man who did not shun doing some things which the sons of Saint Francis could in no manner approve or countenance. He claimed that, owing to his extraordinary position, his acts could not be judged in the same light and by the same standard of justice as those of the rest of men.¹ And when he displayed so much severity in punishing sedition, or reduced the natives to slavery and made gifts of those unfortunate creatures to his friends or admirers,² no true servant

Avendano,—a Grand Dictionary of the Maya language of Yucatan, by Fray Antonio de Ciudad Real.—a Chilean Spanish and Spanish Chilean Dictionary, by Fray Antonio Hernandez Calzada,—a translation of the Gospels in the Tarasco language of Mexico, etc.

¹ In a letter addressed by Columbus to Doña Juana de la Torre, he said: "I must be judged, not as a governor sent to a province the government of which is regularly administered, and in which the laws in existence can be enforced, but as a Captain, conqueror of a warlike nation, different from us in religion and habits, and whose members live scattered through the forests, or sheltered in the mountains."

² Columbus made a present of three hundred Indians to some friends of his who had assisted him in the fitting out of the vessels which brought him to the New World. These unfortunate beings were carried to Spain as slaves. As soon as Queen Isabella heard of this strange gift, she exclaimed with indignation: "*With what right does Columbus dispose of my subjects? Who has given him authority to show his liberality in this way?*" And she ordered at once under penalty of death, that the 300 Indians and all others who might then be found in Spain should be immediately restored to liberty.

of Christ could in conscience fail to disapprove of it. Religious orders are too near to God on the one side and too near the masses of the people on the other, to admit of a compromise or temporization with tyranny.

Much has been said and written in condemnation, not only of Father Boyle, but also of the four Franciscan friars, who came with Bobadilla in 1500, and wrote those famous letters in which Columbus is alluded to as Pharaoh, and in which it was requested that no man from Genoa should ever be allowed to come to the New World. But the very bitterness and earnestness of their condemnation of the state of things which they found at La Española, is the best and the most conclusive proof of the zeal of those Fathers for justice, of their abhorrence of tyranny, no matter by whom it was exercised, or for what reasons it was resorted to, and of their love towards the people whom they were sent to Christianize. They were missionaries, apostles, evangelizers, not government functionaries or agents and assistants of the temporal rulers and abettors of their excesses.

A striking proof of this commendable spirit can be found in the letter which Fray Antonio de Toledo wrote from Santiago de Cuba, on November 12, 1534, to Emperor Charles V., explaining why he had refused to accompany Manuel de Rojas, the governor of the island, to a certain distribution of Indians which had taken place in those days in Bayamo. "I excused myself," says the Franciscan friar, "from going with governor Manuel de Rojas to the city of Bayamo in order to be present at a distribution of Indians, for the simple reason that our rule forbids us such business. *No por otra razon sino porque nuestra regla nos prohíbe estas negociaciones.*"

Bobadilla brought with him to Santo Domingo, or La Española, in 1500, four Franciscan friars,¹ and in 1502, when Ovando landed at this island, he came accompanied by thirteen members of the same religious order.² Subsequently they began to come so frequently, and in such numbers, and spread themselves so widely through the islands and about the continent, that as has been stated, the number of their houses, at such an early period as 1506, attracted the attention of King Ferdinand and induced him to take measures to restrict their increase. Whether it was because of

¹ These friars were Fray Francisco Ruiz, Fray Juan Trasierra, Fray Juan Deleuille, and Fray Juan de Robles.

² They were Fray Alonso del Espinar, Fray Bartolome Ternegano, Fray Antonio de Carrion, Fray Francisco de Portugal, Fray Antonio de los Martires, Fray Moseo de Zafra, Fray Pedro and Fray Alonso de Hornachuelos, Fray Bartolomé de Sevilla, Fray Juan de la Ninojosa, Fray Juan de Escalante, Fray Juan and Fray Pedro, or Pierre, called the Frenchmen on account of their nationality.

some feature of the Seraphic order, which rendered it peculiarly attractive to the people among whom it worked with so much zeal and self-denial,¹ or because of the opinion, more or less firmly rooted in all the sons of St. Francis, that the privilege of the Christianization and civilization of America belonged to them, exclusively,—the fact is that their convents, some of them magnificent specimens of architectural skill, some others simple houses of more or less modest appearance, can be found everywhere upon the soil of the New World, strewn like precious jewels all over its surface. Few of those buildings are now devoted to the purposes for which they were erected; whilst the desecrated majority still remain, protesting with mute eloquence against the folly and ingratitude of men.

It is well known, that in the year 1494, while Columbus was cruising along the southern coast of the island of Cuba, he caused his people to land at a convenient spot near the mouth of the Jatibonico River, and had the holy sacrifice of the Mass offered up there,—for the first time in the island,—on the 6th of July.² It is also well known that when Diego Velazquez came afterwards, with his three hundred followers, to settle in Cuba (1511), one of his companions was the afterwards celebrated Apostle of the Indies, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, who had already entered the order of St. Dominic. But we have no record of the exact date on which the sons of St. Francis set their feet for the first time on the privileged shores of the Queen of the Antilles. There is abundant proof, however, that in 1532, there was already a convent of that order in the city of Santiago de Cuba; and that both in that convent and in all others subsequently established, the indefatigable inmates consecrated themselves wholly to the defense of the people, the alleviation of their sufferings, the enlightenment of their minds, and the redemption of their souls from vice.

We have seen already, how and for what reason Fray Antonio de Toledo had refused in 1534, to accompany Governor de Rojas on his trip to Bayamo. And we shall have only to glance at the records of those days in Cuba, to find everywhere the most abund-

¹ The extreme degree of poverty to which these venerable friars were reduced, is shown by a letter of Fray Diego Sarmiento, then the Bishop of Cuba, dated at Bayamo, April 20, 1556, in which he describes "the calamities and miseries which had befallen the island," and says: "sometimes we have been unable to say Mass, because we had no wine." *Ha faltado el sacrificio de la misa algunas veces, por falta de vino.*

² The first Mass in Havana was said in 1519. This event is commemorated by a monument called *El Templete* (the little temple) raised on the spot. The exact date has never been ascertained.

The first mass in Central America was said at Caxina, now Truxillo, Honduras, on Sunday the 14th of August, 1502, and was attended by Columbus.

ant testimony of the beneficent and civilizing influence of the friars.

The Spanish conquerors of Cuba, and those who afterwards came to settle in the country, were for the most part exceedingly rude and ignorant. The records of the city councils abundantly testify that aldermen, and many other people of social prominence or standing, were unable to write their names; that the friars "taught the people gratuitously how to read and write, and instructed them in the Christian doctrine and in arithmetic, and in serving Mass, and inspired in them the holy love and fear of God, and respect and obedience to their parents, and imparted to them the knowledge of all virtues, principally humility, which is like the foundation and basis of the spiritual building"; and that they, as a Spanish writer of our days aptly puts it, "dispelled that very darkness which ignorance has charged them with having fostered and endeavored to preserve."

The Franciscan convents of the island of Cuba, so far as the knowledge of the writer goes, were eight: one at Santiago de Cuba, which was the first, founded sometime before 1534; another at Havana, established in 1574; a third at Bayamo, founded in 1582; the fourth at Puerto Principe, established in 1599; a fifth at Trinidad, founded in 1713; the sixth at Santo Espiritu, established in 1716; the seventh at Guanabacoa founded in 1722; and the eighth at Villa Clara, or Santa Clara, established in 1730.

The Convent of St. Francis, at Santiago de Cuba, had very humble beginnings. Governor Manuel de Rojas, in a letter addressed by him to the emperor, dated February 27, 1535, says: "In this monastery there are only six or seven friars, and the oldest of them is a man thirty years of age. We should like to have four more sent here, and among them some one of more authority." And Fray Francisco de Avila, the head of the convent, in a letter which he wrote to the emperor, on July 8, 1532, says: "I came here, on the 6th of November, 1531, in company with Vadillo and another friar of my order. He and I came by order of our provincial at Santo Domingo de la Española. The city council here gave us, with much pleasure, the ground on which the monastery is to be erected, as your majesty commanded. Up to the present we have only built the church and one thatch-roofed house, which we, the four of our order who are now here, have chosen for our residence."

But not many years were required to change this state of things. That thatched-roofed house of 1531 soon became one of the most imposing buildings of the city, with many rooms and spacious cloisters and courts.¹ In 1841 the government, in pursuance of

¹ The church has three spacious naves and a front of elegant architecture. Admittance to the church is obtained, in this front part, through three large doors.

the decree of suppression of the religious orders and confiscation of their property, took possession of this convent,¹ and destined it to be used for a barrack. As such it is still used for the forces of artillery and infantry which garrison the city. As if nature itself wished to join in the protest which must be raised at all times against such acts of spoliation, an earthquake in 1852 caused the tower of the church to fall down. No attempt has been made ever since to rebuild it.

The Convent of Havana, the second of the order in Cuba, was a magnificent edifice. A slab, which can still be seen above the central door of the front part of the church, contained the following inscription: *Non est in toto sanctior orbe locus*. Nevertheless, the Spanish government has been using that church, ever since 1854, as a magazine for the custom-house. The convent itself, where St. Francis Solanus occupied a room, embraces an area perhaps twice as large as the treasury of the United States in Washington city. It was turned over to the civil authorities to be used for the custody of all kinds of old documents and papers (*Archivo General de la isla*), and for the accommodation of many officials who are furnished there by the government with commodious lodgings.

This noble building, which is considered the best of its class on the island, is admirably situated upon the very shore of the bay of Havana. The church, annexed to it and at present desecrated, as we have said, has a vaulted stone roof, supported by two parallel rows of substantial columns, forming three spacious naves. The middle one is about 222 feet long by 32 feet wide, while the two lateral naves measure about 177 feet in length and 14 feet in width. The ceiling of the church is very high, and the tower, which is the highest monument built in Cuba, is crowned by a statue of St. Helene.

According to an historian of the last century, there were always in that house from seventy to eighty friars, who occupied themselves, besides performing their religious duties, in the teaching of Latin, theology, philosophy and other branches. This teaching was always gratuitous, and regularly and systematically imparted. The Franciscan fathers of Havana had a regular *maestro* of grammar, a *lector* on philosophy, three professors or tutors (*catedráticos*) of the same science, or rather of some special branches thereof, and teachers of other sciences, mathematics included; and this teaching department of the convent, frequented by a great number of pupils, and imparting education gratuitously (as has been stated and ought to be constantly called to the attention of all

¹ When the convent was taken possession of by the civil authorities in 1841, it was inhabited by twelve friars ordained *in sacris*, and by a number of lay brothers.

those who have interest in educational matters), was under the control and supervision of a prefect of studies, called the *Regente General de Estudios*.

At the earnest request of the citizens of Havana, authority was given to this convent to confer the degree of bachelor both in philosophy and theology; and the studies made there were granted the same official character and validity as those made in any regularly authorized educational establishment of the Spanish monarchy.

As has been stated elsewhere, St. Francis Solano, before going to Peru, where he died, had been one of the inmates of this historical house, and his room was kept for a long time and shown to visitors as a very interesting curiosity.

The storm of "reform" has swept away all that could be removed from this venerable institution which gave to Cuba many men of high rank in science as well as in virtue; but the social structure of the country does not seem to have derived, as yet, the benefit which was expected from the "liberal" measures which scattered to the four winds both the fathers themselves and their property, without sparing their library or even the statues of the saints and other ornaments of the church.¹

The convent of Bayamo, founded by Fray Francisco Adan, with donations in money and materials of all kind which he secured from the citizens of that locality,² can claim the glory of having been the first educational establishment in the island of Cuba. Captain Francisco de Parada made, in 1571, a donation of seventy thousand dollars for the establishment and support of a free primary school, which was entrusted to the Franciscans and attained a great success. The building of this convent is now occupied by some offices of the government.

The convent of Puerto Principe, which belongs also to the sixteenth century—the first century of Cuban history,—was founded by Fray Francisco Amado with funds supplied in part by Diego Sifontes in 1587, and by many other persons, whose names were more or less conspicuously recorded upon the walls of the Church. The old records show that in the immediate neighborhood of this convent there were no more than 180 houses, all of them inhabited by poor people. This convent has the glory of having had among its most active members, the celebrated Father Fray

¹ The writer of the present paper remembers well, although these events took place in the days of his boyhood, the scandal caused in Havana by the breaking and sale for fuel of the statues of the saints, altars, ornaments, etc., of the church of St. Francis.

² All the lime used for the construction of this building was supplied gratuitously by Captain Alonso, one of the citizens of Bayamo.

José de la Cruz Espí, also called Father Valencia, from the place of his birth, still remembered as one of the greatest benefactors of Puerto Principe and its district, and held by popular opinion, even when he was living, to be a Saint. This noble Franciscan who died on May 2, 1838, was highly instrumental in the founding of many great works of charity, and especially the Orphan Asylum (*Casa de Beneficencia*) of Puerto Principe, in which all the poor girls of the city could find shelter and education.¹ When the establishments of beneficence became civil institutions, and the government took charge of this asylum, the first thing which was done was to sell the building. The records of the time show that the government received \$15,084.62½, as proceeds of that sale; but they fail to give any account of the subsequent disposition of the money, much less can it be shown that it was used in any way for the benefit of the poor, unless it were under the theory, often heard in the mouth of some patriotic Spanish statesmen, that the state itself is the first pauper to be relieved.

The convents of Saint Francis, at Trinidad and Santo Espiritu, which are two cities not very far distant from each other, were comparatively small houses. The former never had more than six or seven inmates, whether priests or lay brothers, while the latter, in the days of its greatest prosperity, had only nine friars ordained *in sacris*, and three lay brothers. The convent of Trinidad was built exclusively at the expense of Don Gerónimo de Fuentes and his wife, residents of that city; and the convent of Santo Espiritu by contributions of all kinds from many people.

The great convent of Saint Francis of Guanabacoa, now occupied by the sons of St. Joseph Calasanctius, and used by them as a first class educational establishment, with a certain degree of official authority, as far as the validity of the studies and the degree of Bachelor of arts, or sciences, is concerned, was founded in the early part of the eighteenth century "to aid the Church in satisfying the spiritual needs of the people, and attending to the education of the youth." This house, always spoken of by the historians of the country as a "centre of learning as well as of all virtues" (*depósito de la sabiduría y de todas las virtudes*), magnificently built, with extensive gardens and orchards attached to it, and of course a very handsome church, was from the beginning a regular primary school, for all people, rich or poor, white or colored, and never failed to excite, besides great reverence, profound sympathy and gratitude. The government did not dare to close it, but decided to keep it as a kind of refuge for the members of the order, expelled from the other convents, who were unable

¹ A gentleman of Puerto Principe named Don Lorenzo de Mirando y Agniteria, contributed for this purpose \$22,000.

either from age, or other circumstances (there were two insane in their number), to take care of themselves.

As to the convent of St. Francis in Villa Clara, or Santa Clara, which was the last one of this order founded in Cuba, whatever may be said in its praise scarcely shall meet the requirements of strict justice. It was founded at the request, and by the earnest efforts of Father Juan de Conyedo, a secular priest and benefactor, whose name is associated with the progress and welfare of that city, in which his memory is still kept in the highest veneration,¹ and was used partly as a hospital, and partly as a primary school under the name of "School of Our Lady of Sorrows," independently of the classes of Latin, Philosophy, and other branches, which were open free of cost to all those who cared to attend them.

When this convent and the Church attached to it were closed by the government in 1841, the authorities had to proceed in great haste to prevent any action on the part of the people. A well written and in all respects reliable history of Villa Clara² relates that the hurry of the authorities was such that "no more than one morning was needed to change completely the aspect of the temple, and remove to the storehouses of the government the five altars, the statues, ornaments, furniture, and everything else belonging to it." The whole building, convent and church together, has been used ever since 1849 as a barrack for the troops.

If the history of the sons of St. Francis of Assisi in the New World is as admirable and grand as has been more or less imperfectly outlined in the preceding pages, it does not eclipse, however, in the slightest manner, the brilliant career of the Dominicans.

They came to Santo Domingo, or La Española, if not as early as the Franciscans, at least early enough to allow them, in 1511, to boldly espouse the cause of the natives and denounce the injustice and cruelty of their oppressors. Fray Antonio Montesino, of the order of Preachers, had one day ascended the chair of the Holy Ghost, during a religious festivity of great solemnity, in 1511, which was attended by the second Admiral of the Indies, the royal officers, and the most important personages of the city of Santo Domingo; and, as if inspired by the occasion, or moved by the desire to seize the opportunity, which presented itself to speak to all those officials together, he devoted his sermon to the most earnest condemnation of the cruelties perpetrated against the natives, and to a strenuous exhortation to his audience to change their plan of government and to respect justice and morality.

¹ Father Conyedo was a native of Cuba, born in 1687. He died in 1761.

² *Memoria histórica de la villa de Santa Clara y su jurisdicción*, por Manuel Dionisio Gonzalez. Villa Clara, 1858.

The words of the Dominican priest did not arouse in his listeners any other feeling than anger and a thirst for revenge; and as soon as the Mass was over, the principal authorities proceeded in a body to the house of his order and said to the Superior that if Father Montesino did not withdraw his remarks and express his regret for having uttered them, the whole order would be expelled from the island. The Superior replied, as related by Quintano,¹ that the opinions of Father Montesino were, indeed, the opinions of all his brethren, but that, in order to avoid scandal, he should recommend him to speak with more moderation in whatever sermon he might preach in the future. But either the Superior did not do anything of the kind, or Father Montesino thought it was unworthy of his ministry and of the chair of truth to temporize in any manner, through human respect, with error and iniquity. And so it was, that when he again ascended the pulpit and addressed an audience, made still larger by the expectation of enjoying the apologies to be made by the good friar, the latter raised his voice still louder, reaffirmed, word by word, all that he had said, rebuked the officials, and maintained that by his action he was doing, not only his duty as a minister of the Almighty, but rendering a service, and a most important one, to the king himself.

And when the enraged authorities sent to Madrid their complaints, and the Dominicans were compelled to defend themselves before the Court, they sent, as their representative there, the same Father Montesino; who pleaded so energetically, and demonstrated so clearly the injustice of the slavery to which the natives were subjected, and the iniquities which were perpetrated upon them, that the king ordered him and the other Dominicans to return to America, in order that "through the example of their virtues, and the influence of their good doctrine, the fruit which was desired, namely, the salvation of souls, could be reaped."

But neither this heroic advocate of justice, nor his brethren and associates in the island of Santo Domingo, not less heroic than he, were an exception to the rule. History has recorded, in characters which neither time nor sophistry can obliterate, all that was done in that line, in regard to Cuba and other possessions of the Spanish crown, by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas, the illustrious apostle of the Indies, and by every member of the Dominican order, in favor of the oppressed natives. Moved by his charity and his love of justice, Father Las Casas crossed the Atlantic seventeen times, and went to plead personally, in favor of the people whose protection had been entrusted to him.² Four times he had to go to Germany, where the

¹ *Vidas de Españoles Célebres. Fray Bartolomé de las Casas.*

² Cardinal Jimenez Cisneros appointed Father Las Casas "Protector of the Indians," in 1516.

emperor happened to be, to meet him and present to him in person his arguments and his complaints. As fearless of persecution as of personal danger, he spoke the truth to the monarchs, defended it before the courts and councils, disputed with the learned, struggled with the powerful, and wrote immortal works, in the cause of outraged justice. Through his untiring efforts, the *Audiencias*¹ of America were established, and he himself accompanied to Santo Domingo the first court of this class organized for the New World.

The charge has been made—by those who think to be patriotic by compromising with injustice, or extenuating infamies, and trying to throw discredit on the acts of this great man—that his zeal in favor of the Indians was more in the nature of a hobby than in real hatred of slavery; and it has been said, and repeated, that owing to him and to his efforts African slavery was established in the New World. But the charge is false, as has been proved conclusively. When Father Las Casas wrote the memorial, upon which the whole structure of the charge rests, African slavery was already in existence in America. Chronology, with her inflexible finger, points at the respective dates, and contemptuously dismisses the imputation.

The order of St. Dominic, created in 1216, not to live in solitude and apart from the world, but “to be in constant and efficient contact with civil society, and to take charge of the study and propagation, through their apostolate, of the Divine science,” has had in America the great merit of having devoted itself entirely, not only to the defence of justice, but to the diffusion of learning in all its branches.

Superficial writers are always ready to refer to the Spanish Inquisition and make St. Dominic responsible, as well as the order he founded, for the blood and the sufferings which are charged to that Tribunal. The truth is that, as has been proved by Cantú and others, neither St. Dominic had any share at all in its establishment, nor was his order devised “to impose the faith, but to defend its liberty.” And so well established and recognized is this fact in Spain, that when the committee of the Cortes, which was appointed in 1812 to inquire into the advisability of suppressing the Tribunal of the Inquisition, made their report, which was accepted, in favor of the suppression, the explicit declaration was made that “St. Dominic did not use or advise to use other weapons against heresy than prayer, patience and instruction.”

¹ High Tribunals of Justice, with powers to interfere to a certain extent, and through certain forms of procedure, in the administration of the government. They often checked the tyranny of the Viceroys and Captain-Generals.

Be it as it may elsewhere, the fact is that neither in the island of Santo Domingo, nor in that of Cuba, the Dominican Fathers did more than to defend justice, educate the people and promote their happiness.

They came to Cuba, very few in number, from the neighboring island of Santo Domingo, in the early part of the sixteenth century. They were presided over by Fray Entierrez de Ampudia, who came as their superior, invested with the dignity of Vicar Apostolic for the whole island. When Pope Leo X. created the diocese of Cuba, in 1516, Fray Bernardino de Mera, a Dominican Father, was made the Bishop; but neither he nor his successor, a Franciscan born at Flanders and appointed in 1522, ever came to take possession of their See. Fray Miguel Ramirez de Salamanca, a native of Burgos, also a son of St. Dominic, was then appointed (1528), and he was actually the first Bishop in the island.

The friars of this order did not succeed in having any convent built in Cuba until the year 1578, when, thanks to the generous assistance of several citizens, and pre-eminently of the Count and Countess of Casa Bayona, whose portraits not long ago could yet be seen hanging on the walls of the sacristy, the monumental building which stands near the Palace of the Captain-General, at Havana, was erected for them.

This noble edifice, in which Saint Luis Beltran occupied a room, while on his way to Spain, has been memorable in the history of Cuba, because of its intimate connection with the intellectual progress of the country. At the earnest request of Fray Diego Romero, one of the priests of this house, supplemented by the action of the City Council of Havana, and of other persons and corporations, the "Royal and Pontifical University of St. Jerome," was established at that convent in 1721, and entrusted to the Dominican Fathers. This University was given the same rank and prerogatives as the University of Alcalá de Henares, which had been Cardinal Cisneros' pet, and soon developed into a seat of learning of great celebrity. In 1761 it had three chairs of theology, one of philosophy,—one of what was called "the Aristotelic text," another of what was called "the Master of Sentences,"—three of civil law, two of canon law, four of medicine, and two of mathematics.

Subsequently to that date, new classes were established, in which all branches were taught, and as well and thoroughly as in any contemporary establishment of Europe; and as the teaching was gratuitous¹ and the doors of the classes were open to all, the

¹ The matriculation fee required of the students of the University was merely nominal *fifteen cents (real y medio)*. The graduation fee, in the degree of doctor, consisted in a pair of gloves and a silk handkerchief for each member of the Faculty.

institution became extremely popular, and constituted before long one of the most important factors in the civilization of the country.

In addition to their University labors, many of the priests devoted themselves, gratuitously also, to the teaching of Latin, and Logics, and even Moral Theology, with the book of Father Laraga as text, at extra hours and in their own rooms; and in this way they prepared many a young man for admission either to the University, or to the Seminary for priests attached to the Cathedral, and made their name and their remembrance still more imperishable.

Even after the suppression of the religious orders, these venerable men retained their habits of imparting knowledge to the youth; and the writer of this paper is happy to have a further opportunity at this moment to renew his debt of admiration and gratitude to that noble son of St. Dominic, Fray Ambrosio Herrera, who, while at the convent of Guanabacoa, where he had been sent after the secularization of the University and the suppression of the religious orders, opened in his room a class of Latin and devoted himself from 7 to 9 in the morning, and 7 to 9 in the evening, to the instruction of about twenty or twenty-five boys, who loved him dearly. Neither one cent nor a present did he ever accept; and a portion of his breakfast was regularly distributed among his pupils.

This convent of Havana, in which there were sometimes fifty priests, and even more, became to some extent the real centre of the order in Spanish America. It was, indeed, one of the noblest, grandest and most beneficial institutions of its kind ever founded this side of the Atlantic. And when the University was taken out of the hands of the friars and turned over to the government and made a secular institution, and the matriculation fees were increased from 15 cents to \$25 in Philosophy and \$102 in Law, Medicine, Pharmacy and Theology, the people received a blow which the course of time has not been sufficient as yet to remove entirely from their memory.

There was also a Dominican convent at the city of Bayamo, and another at the city of Santo Espiritu. The former was founded in 1742 and the latter in 1746. Neither of them was a large establishment; but the latter was especially beneficial, on account of a hospital of charity which was attached to it, under the invocation of Jesus of Nazareth.

The convent of Dominicans at Guanabacoa, founded in 1758, was in the order of time the fourth and the last house which those excellent Fathers possessed in Cuba. It was also their last place of refuge. The building is immense, and the church attached to it, and consecrated under the advocacy of *Nuestra Señora de*

la Candelaria, is one of the largest and handsomest of the island. The religious festivities which were celebrated there on Candlemas day, the "novena" which preceded it, and the subsequent "octava," accompanied as they were always with public rejoicings of all kinds, and a fair where money circulated profusely, aided to increase the fame and the material prosperity of the town.

When the British besieged Havana in 1762, and took possession of Guanabacoa, they established their headquarters at this convent. But the outrageous manner in which they conducted themselves, especially in the church, drew upon them such an amount of hatred, that indeed their worst enemies and the most persistent and uncompromising were the citizens of that town.¹ The remembrance of some of these outrages is still fresh in the minds of the people, and has been transmitted faithfully from generation to generation.²

Besides the houses of the Dominicans and Franciscans, others were established profusely both in the Spanish West Indies, and on the Main land, or *Terra firma*, as it was called.

In Cuba, for instance, according to the statement published by order of the government, in pursuance of the decrees of secularization, on December 7, 1841, the number of the convents then in existence, and of their inmates, was as follows:

Order of St. Dominic: the four convents just mentioned with a total of 34 priests and 14 lay brothers.

Order of St. Francis: eight convents as described, with a total of 74 priests and many lay brothers.

Order of St. Augustin: one convent at Havana, with 8 priests and 4 lay brothers. They had classes of Latin and Philosophy.

Order of Our Lady of Mercy: two convents, one at Havana, and another at Puerto Principe, with a total of 27 priests and 2 lay brothers.

Order of Capuchins: one convent at Havana, with only 3 priests.

¹ The name of Jose Antonio Gomez, one of the aldermen of the town became famous in the history of this war for his bold attacks against the British, and his successful leadership, in that locality. The British were so hated, that the people of Guanabacoa did not hesitate to poison the milk and even the water which they furnished them.

² Tradition has preserved among many other outrages perpetrated at the Church, the two following: The soldiers took from its place a picture of Our Lord, which still in the time of the writer of this paper was preserved in a very rich massive frame of silver, and placed it on the pulpit, as in the attitude of preaching, an act which was accompanied with all kinds of jests and irreverence. They also discovered that a statue of St. Francis Xavier, which was in an upper niche, on the sanctuary, had a valuable ring on one of the fingers. To pull down the statue, and get possession of the ring, they tried to lasso to it amidst laughter and mockery, by means of a rope. A historian relates that when the statue fell, it struck the head of the one who pulled the rope, and instantly killed him.

Order of Bethlehemites: two convents—one at Havana, with 3 priests and 10 lay brothers, and one at Santiago de Cuba with 2 priests. The Bethlehemites of Havana had a magnificent hospital for convalescents,—absolutely gratuitous, and also the largest primary school ever remembered in Cuba.¹ They taught gratuitously, to poor and rich, negro and white, noble and plebeian—because the school was open to all, and the prejudice of race, was never felt in Cuba as it is here, even now,—all the primary branches of instruction, that is, reading and writing, arithmetic and Christian doctrine. Those who showed superior talent or industry, received extra lessons of a more advanced character. They all were provided, gratuitously also, with pens and paper, and ink, and catechisms and readers if unable to buy them.

Order of St. John of God: two convents, one at Havana with 2 priests and 11 lay brothers, and one at Puerto Principe with 1 priest and 2 lay brothers. The members of this order were regular physicians, and had a charity hospital attached to their convents.

However imperfect the foregoing sketch may be considered,—and certainly no illusion is entertained by its author that it is an adequate presentation of the subject—it shows abundantly that the religious orders have a most brilliant history of their own in the New World, and that it is proper for Catholics as well as for just men in general to remember it with pride, and have it duly recognized in the approaching festivities.

In regard to the Jesuits, whatever might be said or done in grateful remembrance of their work in this hemisphere, north and south of the equator, would certainly fall short of the requirements of strict justice. Although they arrived in America at a later period than the Franciscans and the Dominicans, their missionary and educational labors were not less glorious and successful. The name of the Society of Jesus is preserved with veneration by the people from the remotest end of South America to the farthest northern extremity of Canada. And one who should ever attempt to write the history of the New World without giving that Order the credit due to it as a principal factor of American civilization, would be far from fulfilling his duty as a historian.

J. I. RODRIGUEZ.

¹ The average attendance was 500.

THE NIMBUS AND AUREOLE.

THE Glory of God, in the sense in which the expression is ordinarily used in Holy Scripture and in the writings of saints and theologians, is of two kinds—essential and accidental. The essential glory of God consists in that absolute will of God which has, of necessity, been fulfilled from all eternity, and will be fulfilled to all eternity. The accidental glory of God is that manifestation of His essential glory which it is the object of creation to promote, although, in itself, it cannot add anything to the infinite glory which He has in Himself. Every external work of God brings to Him fresh accidental glory. All the splendors of the material world form a part of it; above all, the supernatural acts of His rational creatures contribute to it. To increase this accidental glory is the end and object of man; it is the glory of man, made as he is after the similitude of God, to glorify God on earth, as our Lord is said to have done by the complete and perfect performance of His will. Hence, as the will of God becomes more and more clearly reflected in the regenerate will and affections of the just man, he is said to be transformed into the same image, the image of God, from glory to glory.¹

There is one special form of this accidental glory of God, its outward and sensible exhibition, which, in Holy Scripture, commonly receives the name of the glory of God, in the more literal and material meaning of the word. It consists in that brightness cognizable by the sense of sight, whereby God, who is in Himself light, uncreated and eternal, vouchsafed of old to give a sign of His more immediate presence amongst men. It is of this that we intend to speak in the present article.

The idea of visible light has always been intimately associated with the person of the Deity. In the natural order, we are accustomed to look upon the source of life as identical with the source of light. The sun, by whose beams this world of ours is vivified and enlightened, has, from the earliest ages, been regarded, and by some nations adored, as the visible symbol of the invisible and Supreme Being, of whose surpassing splendor the glory of the sun is but a faint and feeble image. St. John, speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem, says that the city had no need of the sun or of the moon to shine in it; "for the glory of God hath enlightened

¹ 2 Cor., iii., 18.

it, and the Lamb is the lamp thereof."¹ The prophet Ezechiel, narrating the visions accorded to him of the unseen world, compares the light emanating from and enveloping the Deity, to fire. "I saw a likeness as of the appearance of fire," "as the appearance of brightness," "the glory of the God of Israel was there."² It was by a manifestation of this splendor, under the semblance of fire, that under the old Dispensation Jehovah usually made His presence known. When Moses was sent as a deliverer to Israel, his attention was, at first, attracted by a bush that was on fire and yet was not burnt. On his going forward to see what he terms this great sight, the unwonted spectacle of flames of fire that shone but did not scorch, that lit up, but did not consume the branches amongst which they played, the Lord God called to him out of the midst of the fire.³ He was at once conscious that he stood in the presence of the living God, the unfading, self-existent light, the God whom his forefathers worshipped. This first apparition was to prepare him for the more dazzling glory that would be revealed when Jehovah graciously made a covenant with the Israelites on Horeb. On that occasion, He descended upon the mount in a luminous cloud, and the sight of the glory of the Lord is said to have been like a burning fire.⁴ Moses, recalling at a later period the circumstances attendant on the giving of the law, says that the Lord spoke to them face to face, out of the midst of fire,⁵ from out of the fiery effulgence which shrouded the Divinity from mortal sight. The psalmist uses no poetical metaphor, no eastern imagery, when, addressing God, he exclaims, Thou art clothed with light as with a garment.⁶ And, as light and joy are intimately connected, he speaks of both as being found by those who are admitted to the glorious presence of God: Thou shalt fill me with joy with thy countenance.⁷ The just shall walk in the light of thy countenance.⁸ The *shechinah*, or cloud of glory and fire that covered the tabernacle of the Jewish temple whenever the presence of Jehovah was revealed in the sanctuary, was an external token of the indwelling majesty of the Godhead, before which even the ministering priests retired in reverent awe.⁹

The conviction that the nature and essence of God is ineffable light was a principle lying at the bottom of the Jewish religion. Thus, St. Paul, writing to his Hebrew converts, used language familiar to them when he spoke of Jesus Christ as the brightness of His Father's glory.¹⁰ Under the new Dispensation, this article of Jewish belief was maintained and confirmed by similar manifestations. The

¹ Ap., 21, 23.

⁴ Ex., xxiv., 17.

⁷ Ps., xv., 11.

⁹ Ex., xl., 32; 3 Kings, viii., 10.

² Ezech., viii., 2, 4.

⁵ Deut., v., 4.

³ Ex., iii., 2.

⁶ Ps., ciii., 2.

⁸ Ps., lxxxviii., 16.

¹⁰ Heb., i., 3.

visions wherewith St. John was favored in Patmos were not unlike the visions of the prophets of old. The insight accorded him into the unseen world showed him the throne of God encircled by a luminous irradiation, taking the colors of light and resembling a rainbow, while it was surrounded by a sea of fire and smoke. In describing the Son of Man in the glory of heaven, he finds nothing to which he can compare Him but the glorious radiance of the midday sun: His face was, as the sun shineth in his power,¹ was resplendent, that is, with a splendor so dazzling that the privileged apostle could not bear to gaze upon it. Tradition states, that at the moment when the Incarnate Word was born into the world, a light of intense brilliance filled the humble cave of Bethlehem, in literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaias:² Be enlightened, O Jerusalem, for my Light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. On the occasion of our Lord's transfiguration, when His divine nature was allowed to pierce the veil of His sacred humanity, the Evangelists assert that His face did shine as the sun, and His very garments became shining, or glittering.³ On the day of Pentecost, it was under the shape of tongues of fire that the third Person of the Holy Trinity descended upon the Apostles. And when the Lord Jesus stayed Saul on the way to Damascus, so vivid was the light that shone from heaven, that it produced temporary blindness, and caused the fearless, resolute man to fall trembling and astonished to the ground.⁴

The dogma and the ritual of the Christian religion, both maintain the same truth which the Jews so firmly held. In the Creed we express our belief that the eternal Word is Light of Light, as He is God of God. In the ceremonial of divine worship artificial light is habitually used as a symbol of the celestial brightness of God's presence. Although the assemblies of early Christians were necessarily held by night, thus gaining for them the mockery of the pagans and the contemptuous epithet of *lucifuga gens*—the people who shun the light—yet, when the Church emerged from the catacombs, the lights which had been needed to illumine the subterranean chapels were retained in the sunlit basilicas of the city. In all the ceremonies, *lumina*, *lampades*, and *candelabra* held a prominent place, and it was customary, from the earliest times, to keep lamps burning upon the altar day and night. St. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, in the end of the fourth century, speaks of the great number of lights burning about the altar, "making night more splendid than day, and the light of day itself more glorious."⁵ The custom of placing lamps on tombs, and lighting up a burying ground,

¹ Ap., i., 16.

² Ch. lx., v. 1.

³ St. Matt., xvii., 2; St. Luke, ix., 29.

⁴ Acts, ix., 3.

⁵ Paulin., Nat., iii., S. Felicis.

practised by the early Christians, was also derived from the more enlightened of the Jews. For them, as for those, it was emblematic of the perpetual light which the Church implores may shine upon the faithful departed; of the glory which the children of God, the children of Light, enjoy in the presence of their Father, in accomplishment of the promise of the Saviour, That the just shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.¹ The inscriptions frequently found on sepulchral stones and tombs of early times, testify to the fact that light was considered as an emblem of celestial bliss, since God, who is Light, will be the happiness of the redeemed. *Luce nova frueris : lux tibi Christus adest*, may be quoted as an instance. De Rossi, the eminent professor of Christian archæology, has observed that in all the monuments which have been discovered in Byzantium and Numidia, the saints and the faithful are represented as being in Paradise by a candelabra as a symbol of light.

We know, moreover, that the glory of which God is the source and centre is communicated to the spirits who are in His presence, and whose privilege it is to gaze continually on his divine beauty. The holy angels, who are about his throne, reflect in their own persons the splendor of the Triune God; they are likened in Holy Scripture, on account of their brilliancy, to a flame of fire. When the Angel appeared to the shepherds who were keeping the night-watches over their flocks, and announced to them the birth of a Saviour, it is said that the brightness of God shone around about them, and the supernatural character of this light, inspiring the rude peasants with awe, caused them to fear with a great fear.² When the Angel of the Lord went to conduct Peter out of the prison, a celestial light shone in the room, and illuminated the gloomy precincts of the dungeon as they passed out into the street.³ Nor is this light communicated to pure spirits alone. The children of God on earth are heirs of glory; the redeemed, after their admission into the presence of God, shine with the joy of beholding the Divine countenance, and the glorified body, too, reflects, in a greater or less degree, the brightness of the eternal Godhead. Amongst the sublime revelations made to St. John in Patmos, he was privileged to behold the Mother of God in heaven, and in these words he describes the stupendous sight: A woman clothed with the sun.⁴ And not the Queen of Angels alone, but many saints and servants of God have been seen after their decease, on different occasions, clothed with celestial radiance. The Blessed Egidius saw, in a trance, the soul of Consalvus, freed from the body, shining with a wondrous splendor and borne by angels

¹ St. Matt., xiii., 43.² St. Luke, ii., 9.³ Acts, xii., 7.⁴ Ap., xii., 1.

through space. It is recorded in the life of a newly-canonized saint, Alonzo Rodriguez, that a departed Jesuit, for whom he was praying earnestly, appeared to him in the enjoyment of the Beatific vision, his face glorious as the sun, with rays of light streaming from his body. The same saint himself was seen, shortly after his death, clad in a robe of magnificent brocade, his whole person beaming with radiance, by a priest who had thought the honors paid to the humble lay-brother somewhat undue.

But it is not only to the disembodied spirit that this lustre is imparted. The frail tenement of clay which, while it is the prison-house of the soul, is also the temple of the Holy Ghost, sometimes participates at the close of its earthly existence in the glory of the soul that informed it, and to which it is, at a later period, to be reunited. It is no uncommon thing for the mortal remains of the saints to emit an ineffable light as well as to exhale a delicious fragrance. The bodies of Christian martyrs, cast into the river or upon the dunghill by command of the Roman judge, were frequently discovered by their friends through the light that hovered over them. The spot where the remains of St. James of Compostella were interred, forgotten for centuries, was revealed by means of a miraculous light, which appeared every night, and attracted the attention of the bishop of the diocese. Gregory of Tours relates that, in his day, at the grave of St. Thomas, in India, there was a lamp which burned without oil or wick, and which no wind could extinguish. It is said that, on St. Jerome's death, a great light, as of the noonday sun, shone about him. The body of St. Ignatius of Antioch, at his martyrdom, was seen by the bystanders to shine like gold or silver. At the moment when the soul of St. Amideus, one of the seven holy founders of the Servite Order, was freed from its earthly prison, a brilliant light was seen in and around the convent, illuminating the whole of Monte Senario, and visible from a great distance. And of St. Buongiunta, another of the same group of saints, it is recorded that, at the time of his happy death, standing before the altar where he had just said Mass, his face, like that of the protomartyr, Stephen, shone like the face of an angel. And as the immortal soul sometimes enjoys on earth a foretaste of future blessedness, so the mortal body, before its dissolution, may reflect some rays of the glory in store for it hereafter. It will be remembered, that after Moses had been holding converse with Jehovah on Mount Sinai, we are told, that when he came down from the mountain his countenance beamed with the reflection of the divine glory: Moses "knew not that his face was horned from the conversation of the Lord," and Aaron and the children of Israel seeing it, were afraid to come near, so that Moses had to put a veil upon

his face, for the glory of his countenance;¹ a circumstance which doubtless added much to the respect wherewith the people, whose leader and legislator he was, regarded him, and prepared them to receive the law he was commissioned to deliver to them.

Instances abound in the pages of Christian hagiology in which close communion with heaven had had a like marvellous effect upon the human body. When Maximinus the bishop repaired, in obedience to St. Mary Magdalen's summons, to the church whither she had been miraculously transported to receive the Blessed Sacrament before her death, he found her in the midst of a choir of angels, elevated in the air, her face shining as the sun from constant converse with angels. St. Andrew, nailed to the cross, preached for two days and two nights to the crowds who were attracted to the place of his martyrdom by the effulgence that shone around him. The holy bishop Ambrose, whilst dictating to his deacon, Paulinus, was seen by him suddenly covered with a shield of fire or glory. When St. Columba celebrated Mass for the last time, on the Sunday preceding his death, his face was illuminated by a glow of light which he explained as caused by the vision of an angel who had been sent to demand "a deposit dear to God." When St. John of the Cross offered the Holy Sacrifice, rays of light used to issue from his countenance. St. Peter of Alcantara was accustomed to recite his breviary at night by the light of his fingers. We are told that St. Francis of Sales, passing the night at a friend's house, was observed by his host at prayer in his room by the light that streamed through the chinks of the ill-fitting boards. In the process of St. Benedict Labre's canonization, several priests, and other witnesses, attested that, on entering a church in which the humble beggar was engaged in prayer at a time when it was deserted and dark except from the glimmer of a few tapers, they beheld an extraordinary light, surpassing in brilliancy that of hundreds of wax candles, enveloping his person, and growing more vivid around his head. On more than one occasion he was thought to be on fire, as sparks scintillated from his countenance and fell on the ground where he knelt.

The pictorial representation in Christian art of the light clothing and emanating from the Divinity, and communicated to persons of eminent sanctity, is called the nimbus, or the aureole.

The nimbus, which, according to the etymology of the word, ought to possess the characteristics of a luminous cloud or vapor, assumes ordinarily the shape of a circular disc, generally opaque, surrounding the head. Sometimes it is nothing more than a halo, or a radiation of light issuing from the head, variously represented by rays of unequal length. Sometimes the rays are linked to-

¹ Ex., xxxiv., 29, 30.

gether at about half their length by a circle which appears to confine them ; sometimes the connecting line is nearer to the head and the rays, instead of emanating from the head, start from the circle surrounding it. Again, in some instances, clusters of rays pass beyond the circumscribing line and diverge in different directions, as light proceeding from a centre diverges; or the circle is broken by convergent rays, broad at the base, where they meet the head, and at the other extremity forming points like those of a star. The nimbus is a Christian symbol suggested by pagan art, where it is frequently met with. The idea that the dwelling place of the immortal gods was the centre of eternal and unfailing light, and that their presence amongst mortals was accompanied by a visible and material glory, was a universal and firmly rooted belief amongst the ancients. At the birth of Zoroaster, that pure emanation of the divinity of the Persians, his body is said to have emitted an effulgence which illuminated the whole chamber. Krishnu lighted up by the rays emanating from his person the place where he passed his infancy. Eastern iconography embodies this idea in its delineations of the innumerable gods and goddesses of the pantheon. They are mostly represented encircled by brilliant rays or flames of fire. Maga, the Hindu goddess, wears a large nimbus or semi-aureole, the circumference of which is indented, the field striated with rays. Parallel with the temples and forehead of the figure three clusters of rays dart forth, corresponding exactly with the divine nimbus of Christian iconography. Surya, the golden-handed, the divine vivifier, stands in a chariot drawn by seven steeds, surrounded by a circle of light. Even the blood-thirsty Kalu is encircled by flamboyant rays. In the sacred Vedas Buddha is described as coming down from heaven " crowned with a rose-hued aureole." Egyptian art places behind the head of Isis, Horus, Osiris and others a flat, golden disc, typical of the sun ; occasionally this is given to the Pharaohs, who were termed sons of the sun, sons of gods. The Persian and Arabic MSS. represented the heads of their kings and superhuman personages surmounted or surrounded by pyramids of fire. The great Syrian goddess has rays of light proceeding from her head. In Etruscan sculpture, Apollo is seen adorned with the nimbus and crowned with seven rays ; Diana with the crescent above, a nimbus behind her head ; while Mercury, recognizable by his wings and caduceus, wears a nimbus in no wise differing from that used by Christians in later times. The Greeks and Romans made constant use of this symbol as denoting divine power and authority. Virgil describes Juno as *nimbo succincta*.¹ Servius defines the nimbus

¹ *Æn.* x., 34.

wherewith Pallas was distinguished at the destruction of Troy as *fulgidum lumen quo deorum capita cinguntur*.¹ In a fresco at Herculanæum Circe shows herself to Ulysses, her head encircled by a nimbus. The Lateran museum contains a statue discovered at Ostia with a nimbus composed of rays of gilt bronze. This radiated nimbus is frequently given to symbolical creatures. The coins of the time of the Antonines bear on the reverse a phœnix, the emblem of immortality, its head enclosed by an indented nimbus. On the coins of Faustina eternity is represented by a peacock adorned in a similar manner.

This conventional ornament, given at first by the Greeks and Romans to the gods, was extended to the effigies of the Emperors, after they began to claim divine honors. The *lux divinum verticem claro orbe complectens* is associated with the fasces and curule chair as symbols of imperial dignity. Trajan has it on the arch of Constantine. It encircles the head of Antoninus Pius on a medal bearing his image. An ancient silver shield found near Geneva in 1722, shows Valentinian adorned with a nimbus, distributing gifts to his soldiers after a victory. On the great shield of Theodosius both the emperor himself and his sons are similarly distinguished. Constantine the Great wears it on some of the coins struck in his reign. The statues of the Merovingian kings which formerly decorated the chief portal of St. Germain-des-Près in Paris, are described as having the nimbus as a sign of regal dignity. In this same sense it is given to the Emperor Justinian, represented in a mosaic of the year 560 in the principal portico of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, kneeling, with Oriental devotion, at the feet of Christ. Heads of the Madonna and St. Michael, in medallions on each side of the throne whereon Christ is seated, are without the nimbus. Priam and Cassandra have it in the Vatican Virgil. In a MS. of the Book of Josue, dating from the 7th or 8th century, not only Josue himself, but several cities represented under the form of female figures, are thus adorned. In the East, where the saints of the Old Testament are far more venerated than in the West, as is testified by the more frequent use of their names among the Greeks, the nimbus was given with great prodigality. The illuminated pages of the MSS. of the 7th to the 10th century, show it assigned to all manner of quasi-sacred personages, *e.g.*, Moses and Eli, Balaam and Samuel, Nathan and Jonas, Isaias, Ezechiel and the prophetess Anna. Nor is it withheld from persons of a different type, witness Saul, who died by his own hand; Achab, who persecuted the prophets of the Lord; the impious Pharaoh, the cruel Herod, Judas, the traitor. Nay more, even the Spirit of

¹ *Ad. En.* ii., 615.

Evil appears in Byzantine art with a nimbus, as, for instance, in one illuminated page where he is portrayed dancing with infernal joy before Job, who is seated on the ruins of his house. This proves that it was considered as an attribute of power or dignity, whether good or evil. Examples might be multiplied of its use in this purely secular sense both in religious and profane art. Occasionally it serves merely to mark the principal figures of a group; in the arch of St. Mary Major we see it assigned to Herod as well as to Christ; in the mosaics of St. Vitais, at Ravenna, to the Emperor Justinian and Theodora his wife, as well as to our Lord and to the Angels. Allegorical figures, too, and symbolical birds and beasts are frequently nimbed.

It may be laid down as a rule that the nimbus does not appear as a peculiarly Christian symbol before the 6th century. About that period it began to be adopted in Christian art as a token of special sanctity, as a pictorial representation of the never fading crown of glory promised as the reward of supernatural virtue and eminent holiness. In the exclusively Christian art of the first five centuries it was almost unknown, instances of its introduction in the catacombs being extremely rare. The vast majority of the frescoes and glasses belonging to the early centuries represent the figure of Christ without the nimbus. In several instances it is found surrounding the head of the Lamb when emblematic of the Saviour. Any work of art in which it is given to Our Lady or the Apostles must certainly be consigned to a later period. For a time its use appears to have been optional, as on one and the same monument the same person is occasionally seen both with and without it; for instance, the frescoes of St. Mary Major, where in the scene of the Annunciation the Blessed Virgin is depicted with the nimbus, whilst in the Presentation she is without it. Buonarruoti gives an illustration of a very curious glass on which St. Stephen is represented sitting listening to the teaching of Christ. Neither of the two figures have the nimbus, whilst between them is a small figure of Christ in the act of benediction, which is nimbed. The reason of this distinction is clearly because the one is intended to represent Christ as a teacher upon earth, the other shows Him in His glorified body, as seen by Stephen in a vision.

The seventh and two following centuries witnessed the transition from the almost complete absence of the nimbus as a Christian symbol to the constant use of it in its spiritual signification of the divine glory, the light of heaven. The images of the Persons of the Holy Trinity were the first to be thus distinguished, and the sacred Humanity of Christ after His ascension, or in the scenes taken from His life on earth wherein His miraculous power was manifested. The angels came next in order, when depicted

in their character of celestial messengers to mankind, as when appearing to Zachary in the temple, to Mary at the Annunciation, or in pictures of the Nativity, Resurrection, etc. Somewhat later the nimbus is given to the Blessed Virgin and then to the apostles. In Byzantine art the growth of the cultus of the Mother of God may be traced—especially after the council which suppressed the Nestorian heresy—by the nimbus being assigned to her and not to the apostles. Witness the Ascension in the cupola of St. Sophia at Salonica, where she occupies the chief place in the centre of the group of apostles, whose upturned gaze follows their Master's ascending form. The same thing may be remarked in the ancient Syriac gospels in the Medicean Library at Florence. In the East the nimbus retained its signification as an attribute of dignity and authority longer than in the West. Here it speedily became symbolic of sanctity alone.¹ It was denied to a king unless he was a saint or reputed as such, and granted to a beggar like St. Alexis, a shepherdess like St. Genevieve, a boatman like St. Julian, provided the innocence and mortification of their lives reflected unmistakably the light of heaven and merited for them "the crown of beauty which the just shall receive at the hand of the Lord."² And as, to the Pagan, the nimbus around the head of monarchs and demi-gods signified the divine power wherewith they were invested, so, to the Christian it signified the gleam from the unseen world which it is sometimes permitted to mortals to behold resting on the chosen servants of God, or hovering over the place of their sepulture. It is related of a painter who was engaged in painting the figure of St. Anthony on the wall of the tomb where his remains were deposited, that while he was removing the surface of the wall around the head of the figure, before gilding the nimbus that was to surround it, suddenly through the chinks of space thus laid bare a light of extreme brilliance shone out, full in the artist's face, dazzling him to such an extent that he was compelled for a time to discontinue his work.

Although the most usual form of the nimbus is that of a circle, or disc of solid metal, or burnished gold, it also assumes other shapes and varies in color. Sometimes the disc is suspended above the head, very like the flat metal plates fastened in heathen times above the heads of statues standing in the open air, for the purpose of defending them from the rain and dust; in this case it is an oval, or circle seen in perspective. Up to the twelfth century it was frequently diaphanous or semi-transparent, indicating that the artist meant to represent a luminous irradiation; and as the clouds

¹ The name given to the nimbus in German is *Heiligenschein*, the lustre of saints.

² *Wisd.* v., 17.

take color from the sun's rays, so this glory, pictorial light, assumed the different hues of the spectrum. Gold is, however, by far the most prevalent, as being the most like to light or fire; it is almost invariably used for the Divine Persons, and also for the principal saints. The Old Testament saints often have a nimbus of silver. Red is the color supposed by some to belong to virgins, green to the married, pale yellow to penitents, etc., but these distinctions must be regarded as more fanciful than real. In the twelfth century or thereabouts, the nimbus frequently assumed the form of a broad golden band, a circlet surrounding or suspended over the head. When it is of a square or oblong shape, this denotes that the person to whom it is given was living at the time the work was executed, for the circle is symbolic of eternity, the square being the symbol used by ancient geometers for the earth and the circle for heaven. A mosaic in the Church of St. Cecilia, at Rome, shows Pope Pascal bearing a model of the church of which he was the founder; in this his nimbus is square. Another mosaic represents St. Peter giving to Leo III. the insignia of the papacy, and a standard to Charlemagne; the glory round the head of the Apostle is circular, round those of the Pope and the Emperor, from whose reign the work dates, it is quadrilateral. Again, in a miniature preserved at Monte Cassino, St. Benedict is delineated delivering the rules of the Order to the Abbot John. Both the Holy Founder and an angel who is present have a round nimbus, whereas in the case of the abbot, in whose lifetime the painting was finished, it is oblong. It is to be regretted that this distinction of shape was not universally observed, as it would be of value in determining the date of the monument whereon it were found. In some rare instances the nimbus is lozenge-shaped, while in the works of Italian artists about the ninth century it takes the peculiar form of a scroll of parchment unfolded in the centre and remaining partially rolled at each end. The triangular form, which does not appear until a later period, is reserved for the first Person of the Holy Trinity; sometimes rays issue from each side of it.

Very frequently the nimbus is ornamented with various devices, or letters; or the name of the Saint whose head it encircles is inscribed upon it to remove all doubt of identity. The *A* and *Ω* are often seen in the nimbus of Christ. A cruciform nimbus, either with or without the circle, now peculiar to the Saviour was, formerly appropriated to all the three Persons of the Godhead, to distinguish the Creator from His creatures. The disc is intersected by bars increasing in width at the circumference, which, meeting in the centre, cross it at right angles, thus forming what is called a Greek cross. One of the half bars is concealed by the head, the others extend, one vertically from the summit of the head, the

others horizontally from the temples. The propriety of the Redeemer being represented with a nimbus thus decorated is obvious; but why, it may be asked, should it be given to the Eternal Father and the Holy Spirit? It seems doubtful that in this ornament an allusion is designed to the cross of Calvary, the more so as the halo encircling several Hindu and Buddhist divinities, and of some gods of the Romans, is, as we have seen, marked with a similar cross, and it cannot be imagined that in these instances the instrument of the Passion is indicated. We must, therefore, conclude that the cross or transverse rays in the divine nimbus are expressive of the eternal sovereignty of God extending in all directions. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that a right hand, issuing from a cloud, and decorated with a nimbus containing a cross, is no unusual symbolic representation of the power of the Most High. The ignorance of artists often leads to the Divine Persons being depicted with a plain nimbus. This happened often in the infancy of Christian art; on many of the earliest pictures of Christ on sarcophagi or elsewhere, He has a nimbus in no wise differing from that of the Apostles near Him. A contrary and much less common error is that of representing an ordinary mortal with the crossed nimbus. An ancient psalter, for instance, of the ninth century, contains at the commencement, within an illuminated capital, a young man holding a book in his left hand and in his right a pen, which he is in the act of dipping into the ink, while he listens to the inspirations of a dove hovering close to his ear. This writer, doubtless intended for David, wears the divine nimbus. In a French MS., of the tenth century also, the foremost of the three angels who visited Abraham, is similarly distinguished.

A missal of the fifteenth century contains a painting of the nativity of the Blessed Virgin, in which a golden cruciform nimbus is given to the Infant Mary, her person also being enclosed in an aureole. This is, however, an isolated and almost solitary instance of divine attributes being ascribed to Our Lady.

The nimbus is given, besides, to allegorical figures, personifications; for example, of the cardinal and theological virtues, or characters familiar to us in the parables of the Gospel, such as the wise and foolish virgins. During mediæval times the Church was frequently represented as a female, crowned and nimbued, holding a chalice and a cross.

The aureole appears in Christian art somewhat later than the nimbus, and is quite distinct from it. The nimbus, as has been said, encircles the head; the aureole envelopes the whole figure. The nimbus is round like the head. The form of the aureole is an elongated oval, usually a vesica piscis. Occasionally it is a quatrefoil. It is seldom otherwise than golden in hue, as its name

indicates (*aureolus*, golden). According to another derivation, the name comes from *aureola*, the diminutive of *aura*, a zephyr, breath, a flame. The origin of the aureole is traced by some writers to the images within bucklers, *imaginès clypeatæ* of the Romans, in which a bust or half-length figure stands out in relief from a round or oval shield. These were suspended in the temples, and may have suggested to Christian artists the idea of placing the head or figure of a saint in a medallion or blind window in churches, as was often done. In one of the mosaics, in St. Mary Major, the aureole takes the character of a solid shield, protecting the persons of Moses and Aaron from the stones hurled at them by the adherents of Kore and his companions. This recalls the words of the psalmist, Thou hast crowned the just as with a shield of Thy good will.¹

As a rule, to which the above instance forms an exception, the aureole is the distinctive attribute of the glorified body. Rarely found in heathen art, in Christian iconography its use is exclusively restricted to the Persons of the Holy Trinity, to the Blessed Virgin, and to the souls of the just represented under the symbol of a child unclothed. It is given to the sacred humanity of our Lord in representations of the Transfiguration, the Resurrection, the Ascension; when He is standing, or seated on his throne in heaven, and when, at the Second Advent, He comes with clouds of light to judge the world. Didron thus defines the circumstances under which it is given to Our Lady: When she is holding her divine Son in her arms; when, at the Assumption, she is carried by angels to heaven; when, at the last judgment, she intercedes for sinners; and when she is depicted as the Woman of the Apocalypse. Scarcely a single instance is known of the aureole being given to angels, excepting in the delineation of the nine hierarchies in the Cathedral of Chartres, where the thrones are enclosed in an elliptical aureole of a red color, as being depositaries of Divine Power, and consequently entitled to one of the attributes of the Godhead. Doubtless, to this choir the angel belonged whom St. John saw coming down from heaven,² having great power, and enlightening the earth with His glory, the glory, that is, of the Almighty God. In another window of the same cathedral of Chartres, the soul of St. Martin is seen ascending to heaven in a vesica piscis, as St. Benedict is said to have beheld the soul of Germanus, Bishop of Padua, conveyed to heaven in a sphere of fire. In representations of the weighing of souls by St. Michael in the balance after death, or of the contest of good and evil spirits for their possession, the disembodied spirits of the just, generally under the

¹ Ps., v., 13.

² Ap., xviii., 1.

form of tiny nude figures, are depicted enclosed in a shining aureole, or surrounded with a glory of golden rays, already resplendent with the eternal light.

What is in art specifically termed the glory is a combination of the nimbus and aureole. It is a radiance of no definite shape, a splendor or luminous cloud proceeding from the whole figure, of greater intensity and brilliancy around the head. This strict definition is, however, not invariably adhered to; the word aureole being employed not only for the glory, but occasionally—although quite wrongly—to designate the halo about the head alone. The aureole differs from the glory in having a clearly defined outline; it is sometimes ornamented with various devices, spangled with stars, filled with clouds, supported by the hands of angels, or surrounded with flamboyant rays. It is a sign of apotheosis, being rightfully given to none but those who have entered into the *locum pacis et lucis*, into the brightness of celestial glory, of the eternity to which the Christian looks forward, and in the light of which he ought to live.

ELLIS SCHREIBER.



COLUMBUS AND THE "SCIENTIFIC" SCHOOL.

IN this year of grace, America will offer, justly offer, tributes rich and many to the discoverer of the New World. Patient, earnest student of books and of nature, he deserves an especial tribute from American students, and above all from Catholic American students. How could, how should they honor him? By turning into English, word for word, and by editing in the most scholarly way his writings, the official documents referring to him before and after the discovery, and the *Historie*, attributed to his son, Don Fernando.

To-day, as when living, Columbus is the victim of "the perfidy of the envious, the calumny of the traducer." In the New World where, first of men, "he planted the sacred sign of the Cross," and where humbly,—proudly, first of men, he uttered "the Divine name of the Redeemer, name which, to the sound of the murmuring waves, he had so often sung upon the open sea"—even here, there are spiritless men who would again fasten upon him "the chains with which, though innocent, he was loaded." To the perfidious, the envious, the calumniator, Columbus made answer during his lifetime. His mind, heart, soul; his deeds, motives, habits, sufferings,—the man,—we know, intimately, from the records he made, and that have been happily preserved. "*Columbus is one of us.*" A Catholic, we owe him at least the love, the loyalty of brothers. From none else can he expect justice. In his deeds we have, ever shall have a part. The reflection of his glory shines upon each one of us, glorifies us. How great that glory is! "By his work a new world flashed forth from the unexplored ocean, thousands upon thousands of mortals were returned to the common society of the human race, were led from a barbarous life to peacefulness and civilization, and—what is of much more importance—were recalled from perdition to eternal life by the bestowal of the gifts which Jesus Christ brought to the world."

Truly, "no grander, no more beautiful work, has been ever accomplished by the hand of man. And to him who accomplished it, there are few who can be compared in greatness of soul and of genius." The calumniators, the traducers, are bold because all the proofs of the greatness of soul of Columbus, are not within reach of the people. With a show of learning—false show—the calumniators misstate facts. They misquote, mistranslate, garble the very words of the genius, whose shoe-lachets they are not worthy

to untie. Deliberately they smother his voice, "tear out his tongue,"—belie his thought. To him, as to the English speaking world, no more timely service could be done, no surer way of confounding his enemies could be devised, than by "popularizing" his writings and true history.

By the united action of all our Catholic historical societies, the work could be done. From South America, from Spain, from Italy, from France and England, help would freely come. The encouragement of our hierarchy would not be wanting. From the illustrious, the learned Pope, who has just spoken so justly of the great discoverer, something more than kind words would surely come. The task would be arduous, but not so arduous as that which Columbus performed. The pay could not be less than he received. Glory there would be, though not equalling his glory. Defending truth, our learned men would testify publicly, lastingly, to their mindfulness of the debt American Catholics owe to the great soul and great genius, who inspired by their faith, risked and suffered that he might "open access to the Gospel in new lands and in new seas."¹

Why the discoverer of the New World should have suffered from perfidy and from calumny during his lifetime, and why, immediately after his death, detractors should have sought to sully his fair fame, we can easily understand. The honors he won, the power he temporarily exercised, his very virtues embittered the Spaniard, hidalgo, pilot, seaman, colonist, official and cleric. Ambition foiled, greed repressed, criminality punished, disorder restrained, virtue and piety taught by example,—have ever excited the most virulent passions of the human heart, envy, hatred, the spirit of revenge. But to-day, when Columbus has been nigh four hundred years in the grave, why should men, with whose ambitions or vices he cannot interfere, pursue him as though he had shamed them by his example, or, by his grand actions, had made them feel their own littleness? Must we seek an answer in the fashionable and convenient "atavism." With a qualification, we answer: Yes, from father to son, hates are handed down that have not been caused by ambition, envy or greed—hates born of prejudice; and there are new hates daily born out of ignorance, out of conceit, out of the evil spirit of notoriety, and out of the prolific father of lies. How shall we classify our contemporary defamers of him who accomplished a work so grand and so beautiful that no man has ever surpassed it? Perhaps they do not admit of classification

¹ This quotation and the previous quotations, are taken from the "Letter of Leo XIII. to the Archbishops and Bishops of Spain, Italy and the two Americas, upon Christopher Columbus," dated July 16, 1892.

under any heading here suggested ; and, if so, it may be to their credit.

Among recent book-makers who have chosen Columbus as a timely subject, Mr. Justin Winsor must be mentioned.¹ Were he as capable as he is pretentious, he might hope to become a historian, in the distant future at least. Beyond his pretensions he displays no quality more than common, if we except his humor. The only American historian who, in respect of humor, will bear a comparison with Mr. Winsor, is the famous Mr. Twain. Reading amusedly the Harvard Librarian's pages we say, again and again : The writer is making game of us. Evidently, an oddish mind has imagined a comic "Christopher Columbus." The idea is novel. And what a surprise for those who take the author seriously, when he acknowledges the whole thing to be a joke !

How varied, how spontaneous, how artful, Mr. Winsor's humor is, a few extracts from his tome will show. Writing of Columbus in Portugal, our author says : His wife's sister, by the accepted accounts, had married Pedro Correa, *a navigator* not without fame in those days, and a companion in maritime inquiry upon whom Columbus could naturally depend,—*unless, as Harrisse decides, he was no navigator at all.*² A Celt would have written : "at all, at all ;" but even without the repetition, we estimate this as one of the choicest of American "bulls." And a "bull" is always humorous, especially if it be, as it is here, deliberate.

A few pages further on, the author is debating "whether or not," Columbus had ever sailed to the far north. "The only evidence that Columbus saw Tile," our author assures us, "is in what he further says, that he was able to ascertain that the tide rose and fell twenty-six fathoms, which observation necessitates the seeing of *some land, whether Tile or not.*"³ Those who do not see the humor in this passage may accuse Mr. Winsor of confusion of thought ; but later quotations will make it evident that he can confuse thought without being knowingly humorous. Were we not convinced that we have presented an example of Winsorian humor, we should readily label the extract ludicrous confusion.

On page 160, we meet with a happy "hit," which, if we do not mistake, is at least a triple *entendre*. The author is portraying Ferdinand, and Mr. Winsor's portraits are never "the filling up of a scant outline with the colors of an unfaithful limner."⁴ No, indeed ! However, let us hasten to see Ferdinand. "The king, perhaps, was good enough for a king as such personages went in the fif-

¹ *Christopher Columbus, and How He Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery*. New York, 1892.

² *Christopher Columbus*, p. 131. The italics are ours.

³ Winsor, p. 135. Italics ours.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

teenth century; "perhaps" and "went," you feel the art, surely; "but his *smiles* and *remorseless coldness* were *mixed* as few could mix them even in those days." Even in those days! Perfection itself! The limning has all the gleefulness of conviviality. Remark the mixing, "as few could mix them," of "smiles" with "coldness,"—remorseless coldness! And the conception of the expert king thus mixing *his* smiles! In filling up a scant outline with color—of a suspiciously ruby tinge—Mr. Winsor is unapproachable.

From a brilliant palette, the artist selects a charming combination of tints with which to fill in a scant outline of Isabella. He knows how to place, masterfully, a humorous dab. Santangel is in the queen's "cabinet." He is pleading with Isabella to recall Columbus. "A shade came over the queen's face. The others knew it was the thought of Ferdinand's *aloofness*."¹ In that one quaint, delightful, Twainish word, "*aloofness*," what a wealth of burlesque humor is safe-deposited! A shade of *aloofness*! Mr. Winsor is almost too funny.

Always catching, his humor is never forced. As an example of bubbling, natural fun, we shall quote from p. 276. Columbus, on the second voyage, arrives at Hispaniola, but finds no trace of those he had left behind. In quest of information, he visits Guacanagari. Only a master dare venture to be jocose at this moment. Mr. Winsor has no fear. "The interview did not end," he says, "without some strange manifestations on the part of the cacique, *which* led the Spaniards for a moment to fear that *a trial of arms* was to come. The chief was not indisposed to *try his legs enough* to return with the Admiral to his ship that very evening."² With this passage as a text, one might compose a volume on the science and art of humor. Note how the "*which*" happily prepares a reader for a surprise; and how the word "*enough*" restrains the risible propensities within due bounds "*to try his legs enough!*" Classical, indeed!

From the pages of "Christopher Columbus," we have culled more good things than are usually found in a sarsaparilla almanac. Regretfully we are compelled to retain the greater number of them for our own delectation. The reader will pardon us a word of caution. Read Mr. Winsor carefully. Be on the "alert" always. He is at times over-refined, and unless your attention be constant, you are sure to miss many of his nicest effects.

We hesitate to do our author an injustice by assuming that his work is wholly, or even partly, serious. If it were serious, then his pretentiousness would be more amusing than his humor. Re-

¹ Winsor, p. 178.

² We have used italics here, lest some one might miss any portion of the humor.

viewing the biographers of Columbus, Mr. Winsor finds them all inferior to himself. Washington Irving, especially, he contemns and condemns. It is true that Irving "produced a book that has long remained for the English reader a standard biography. Irving's canons of biography were not, however, such as the *fearless* and *discriminating* student of to-day would approve." "The learning which probes long-established pretenses and grateful deceits was not acceptable to Mr. Irving." Alexander H. Everett said that the perfection of Irving's book was the despair of critics, but Mr. Everett "was forgetful of a method of critical research that is not prone to be dazed by the prestige of demigods." The "fearless" champion of the "not prone to be dazed method" quiets our alarm with the soothing statement that, though "dangerously seductive to the popular sense," "Irving's book has lost ground in these later years among scholarly inquirers. They have by the collation of its narrative with the original sources discovered its flaccid character. They have outgrown the witcheries of its graceful style. They have learned to put at their value the repetitionary changes of stock sentiment which swell the body of the text, sometimes provokingly."¹ Humboldt evidences "a critical spirit, in which Irving was deficient;"² "Irving, whose heedless embellishments of the story of these times may amuse the pastime reader, but hardly satisfy the student."³ "Irving at one time berates the biographer who lets "pernicious erudition" destroy a world's exemplar; and at another time he does not know that he is criticising himself when he says that "he who paints a great man merely in great and heroic traits, though he may produce a fine picture, will never present a faithful portrait."⁴ Thus the learned prober of "grateful deceits," the scholarly inquirer, swells the body of his text, to the amusement of the "pastime reader," with heedless "beratings" of the not unscholarly or uncritical Irving. The "whicheries" of Mr. Winsor's style may prove seductive to popular lovers of nonsense; but, on the whole, we imagine that the verdict of students will be that he is provokingly repetitionary and altogether debarred from the prestige of a demigod.

Mr. Prescott, our critic graciously concedes, was "more independent in his views of the individual character round which *so much revolves*, and the reader is not wholly blinded to the unwholesome deceit and overweening selfishness of Columbus." And yet "Prescott shared something of the spirit of Irving in composing a history to be read as a pastime rather than as a study

¹ Winsor, p. 56. Italics ours.

² Winsor, p. 60.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 501.

of completed truth."¹ It is true that we find this independent student of the character, "round which so much revolves," saying that "whatever the defects of Columbus's mental constitution, the finger of the historian will find it difficult to point to a single blemish in his moral character." And "we find him further saying that whether we contemplate his character in his public or private relations, in all its features it wears the same noble aspects. It was in perfect harmony with the grandeur of his plans, and with results more stupendous than those which heaven has permitted any other mortal to achieve."² Mr. Prescott was something of a scholar and critic, and won the respect of several men of character, and yet Mr. Winsor charges him with flagrant untruthfulness. "It is certainly difficult," are Mr. Winsor's words, "to point to a more flagrant disregard of truth" than Prescott was guilty of, in the passage just quoted. We are more than ever positive that much of pastime revolves about the Cambridge "historian."

To Humboldt, as the student of "completed truth" calls von Humboldt, our author shows a patronizing spirit of consideration, though he is careful to advise us that even "the learned German" was unfitted to form any true estimate of Columbus. The great naturalist pays many a warm tribute to the Admiral's love of nature, and to his remarkable powers of observation and of description. But "the fact was that Humboldt transferred to his hero something of the superlative love of nature that he himself experienced in the same regions; there was all the difference between him and Columbus that there is between a genuine love of nature and a commercial use of it."³ In this sentence, the discrimination of the learned American is superlatively exhibited, and his critical acumen, as well as the lucidity of his expression, must appal those who are not snickering.

Without the aid of Mr. Henry Harrisse's researches, Mr. Winsor says that it would have been quite impossible for him "to have reached conclusions on a good many mooted points in the history of the Admiral and of his reputation." Still, there are spots on some demigods, and Harrisse, not being Winsor, must have faults. "He is a good deal addicted to hypotheses, but they fare hard at his hands if advanced by others."⁴ Mr. Harrisse deserves a criticism more severe than Mr. Winsor is capable of writing. Rev. L. A. Dutto has shown that the author of "Christophe Colomb" is addicted to more than hypotheses, and that there are many mooted points on which he has reached conclusions that are groundless.⁵ However, it will be satisfactory to unpastime readers

¹ Winsor, p. 58.

² *Ibid.*, p. 503.

³ See *Catholic World*, February, March, April, 1892.

⁴ Winsor, p. 501.

⁵ Winsor, p. 52.

to know that Mr. Winsor could not have done what he has done without the aid of one who is "a good deal addicted to hypotheses."

For Roselly de Lorgues, Mr. Winsor has so fine a contempt that he couples the Frenchman's name with Irving's. And here we feel bound to credit Mr. Winsor with a phenomenal power of sarcasm,—a power which he does not always use moderately. De Lorgues's character as a historian our American mental athlete annihilates under the crushing epithet of "canonizer," or the still more deadly term, "sympathizer." Indeed, he hurls these Titanic word-boulders at all those who, living vainly, differ with him. What an awful power may be stored in one puny hand! Mr. Winsor should be merciful.

Against M. de Lorgues he has a special grievance. The French writer said, "that if we cannot believe in the supernatural we cannot understand this worldly man."¹ M. de Lorgues should not have said this, and he did not say this. He may have said that if we cannot believe in the supernatural we cannot understand Columbus; and saying this M. de Lorgues stated a "completed truth." But Mr. Winsor, who perhaps wishes us to know that he is not a believer in the supernatural, or who perhaps is humorously posing as a "philosopher," makes an end of the "sympathizer" with one cutting sentence: "Columbus was a mundane verity." The conclusion draws itself. What has the supernatural to do with a "mundane verity?" And where is the mundane verity that Mr. Winsor, fearless of the daze of demigods, cannot understand?—unless, of course, Mr. Harris should decide there are no mundane verities at all. Thus, with remorseless pestle, the critical researcher macerates contemporary and predecessor in his world-wide and inch-deep mortar. Behold the "scientific" school! he cries. Look ye upon the fearless, the only representative of historical research!

Taking Mr. Winsor seriously, a serious critic would surely set him down as not merely pretentious, but also as one of the most ludicrous pretenders that has ever written about Columbus. Reading laboriously his ill-ordered, ill-written book, we are reminded of his own words: "His arrogant spirit led him to magnify his importance before he had proved it; and he failed in the modesty which marks a conquering spirit." Mr. Winsor's deficiencies of intellect and of education are so apparent, that modesty would have been more becoming to him than this arrogant spirit of self-magnification. His importance he has proved sufficiently.

Mr. Irving, Mr. Prescott, could write their own language cor-

¹ Winsor, p. 54.

rectly. M. Roselly de Lorgues is equally well educated. Mr. Harisse, like von Humboldt, has a fair command of two languages. A critic who would compare with these men should be able to write at least one language as well as a dull school-boy of twelve. We have no stomach for the work, but perhaps some friend of good English will be tempted to gather from Mr. Winsor's book all the barbarous paragraphs and sentences with which it is "heedlessly embellished." The volume will be as great a curiosity as the famous "English, How She Is Spoke." A few choice selections we may quote here :

In 1492, Columbus, "a disheartened wanderer, his mule plodding the road to Cordoba, offered a sad picture to the few adherents whom he had left behind. They had grown to have his grasp of confidence, but lacked his spirit to clothe an experimental service with all the certainties of an accomplished fact." Their growth to his grasp we appreciate, but their fatal lack of spirit to clothe, we have not grown to grasp. However, it was with this lack of spirit that they visited the queen. Before her they proceeded to paint pictures: "The vision once fixed in the royal eye, spread under the warmth of description, into succeeding glimpses of increasing splendor. Finally the warmth and glory of an almost realized expectation filled the cabinet." Naturally, a messenger was forthwith sent after Columbus, and speedily grew to grasp him. "There was a moment's hesitancy, as thoughts of cruel and suspended feelings in the past came over him" . . . Shaking off the suspended feelings of the past, he turned his plodding mule. "Columbus was sought once more, and in a way to give him the vantage which his imperious demands could easily use."¹ The condition of the "royal eye" the most unsympathetic reader will pity. Imagine a vision fixed in your plebeian eye, and spreading into succeeding glimpses; while the warmth and glory of an expectation filled your cabinet! But why, under any circumstances, should Columbus have been sought in a way to vantage imperious demands that he could easily use? The secret Mr. Winsor discloses years after the mysterious facts above narrated. "He had always reached a coign of vantage in his personal intercourse with the queen;"² carried a coign with him, we surmise. It is the "modest" architect of these sentences who says of Columbus: "He wrote as easily as people of rapid impulse do, when they are not restrained by habits of orderly deliberation. He has left us a mass of jumbled thoughts and experiences, which, unfortunately, often perplex the historian, *while they of necessity aid him.*"³ Heigh-ho! Let us be merry! All the perplexing jumblers shall be duly restrained by orderly deliberation,—in good time.

¹ Winsor, p. 179.

² *Ibid.*, p. 409.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

In descriptive passages, Mr. Winsor is seductive, graceful, and often dangerously bewitching. Witness the psychologico-poetical description of the departure of Columbus on the second voyage. "There were cavalier and priest, hidalgo and artisan, soldier and sailor. The ambitious thoughts which animated them were as various as their habits. There were *those* of the adventurer There was the brooding of the administrators, with unsolved problems of *new communities in their heads*. There were ears that already caught the songs of salvation from native throats. There was Columbus himself. . . . To his ears the hymns of the Church soared with a militant warning, dooming the heathen of the Indies, and appalling the Moslem hoards that imperilled the Holy Sepulchre."¹ Shade of Irving! There *are* ears, indeed!

The scene changes. The anti-canonizer, on his way to welcome Bobadilla, whispers to us: "The queen had been faithful, but the recurrent charges had given of late a wrench to her constancy."² A member of the "scientific school" may yet find this historical wrench. If so, the Harvard Library will, perhaps, receive an addition to its treasures. Many lucid, logical, unimpulsive passages we evade, in order to quote Mr. Winsor's judgment on the well-known letter of Columbus to Doña Juana de la Torre. "While its ejaculatory statements are not well calculated to impose on the sober historian, there was enough of fervor laid against its background of distressing humility to work on the sympathies of its recipient, and of the queen, to whom it was early and naturally revealed."³ Of the foreground of this epistle, there is not a syllable. Is there somebody who can scientifically determine how much fervor must be laid against the background of an ejaculatorily humble, argumentative letter, in order to work on a recipient's sympathies? We question whether a sober historian could solve the problem. And yet there is such a thing as guessing; and Mr. Winsor knows more about it than most men. When the discoverer of America reached the line of no variation his attention was awakened. "To an observer of Columbus's quick perceptions," our critic says, "there was a ready guess to possess his mind."⁴ Argal, we maintain, there may be a ready guess to possess another's mind, and thus to observe the enoughness of the lay of fervor against the before-mentioned epistolary background.

Do we run the slightest risk of contradiction in saying that if Mr. Winsor is not humorous he is "verging on" idiocy, as he would put it, or idiotic, to speak plainly? The extracts we have made are not the most puerile in the book. And yet here is a man who cannot write a clear, correct sentence; who cannot logi-

¹ Winsor, p. 265.² *Ibid.*, p. 393.³ Winsor, p. 408.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

cally connect sentence with sentence; who does not know the meaning of words,—and therefore has no power of analysis,—and who, seriously presents himself before the public as a scientific, critical historian! Many of his defects could not be corrected in the most thorough school. His mind is confused, wobbling, by nature. This confusion is shown in the form of his sentences, in the collocation of the different parts of speech, in the inconsequences of which he is profuse, in the “flaccidity” of his statement, in the “body-swelling” rhetoric; in the vacuous judgments, in the laughable mixture of figures of speech. The history of American literature offers nothing so amusing as the attempt of Mr. Winsor to lift himself above Irving and Prescott, men of natural parts, rarely gifted, well educated, cultivated; men of taste, having an agreeable style; and, withal, modest men.

A reviewer in the “Catholic World,” honors our American “scientist” by suggesting that he is a second Froude. The name becomes him in one sense only. Mr. Froude always pleads a cause, regardless of the right or wrong involved. Facts he will misstate, suppress, if misstatement or suppression suit his purpose. Throughout the world, his name is a synonym for “a flagrant disregard of truth.” In fact his school is quite as scientific as Mr. Winsor’s.

From the first paragraph of the first page, we see Mr. Winsor’s case, and the methods he will adopt. The assumption of superiority, the claims to learning, to critical ability, to comprehensive study, to acquaintance with “original” sources, while they evidence the childishness of his mind, are at the same time a proof that, if he be in real earnest, he hopes to have only ignorant readers, and to carry them by his want of modesty.

In his book, there is not a single fact stated that is not known to every one who has an acquaintance with the Columbus literature. He has only hackneyed material at hand, and like a hack he uses it. There is not in his book a suggestion of any value; nor a thought of any value. Indeed, we do not hesitate to say that Mr. Winsor has never had, and will never have, a thought of any value. Against Columbus he has not devised a single new charge. Every one of the charges he repeats at second, third, tenth hand, has been answered by men of mind, of honesty, and of scholarship. From one end of his volume to the other there is no sign of scholarship. In the body of his text he mentions, and occasionally quotes authorities, but he gives no proof of having consulted any of them. He has not committed himself by reference to any page of any edition; and “there are ear”-marks,

¹ January, 1892.

as he might say, that whoever gathered his material did not always have "originals" open before him. A scholar does not work after this fashion. And no intelligent student wastes time on "histories" thus manufactured. Centuries will come and go before Mr. Winsor shall have evolved into an original authority.

Indeed, the author's assumption to be *the* representative of his school is not gracious. This honor belongs to Mr. Eugene Lawrence, and we are not surprised that, in an article,¹ which shows all the scholarship that could be expected from a "tertiary" man, the scientific Lawrence does not breathe the name of Winsor. The attempt to rob Mr. Lawrence of laurels hard-earned, deserved this timely, this scathing rebuke. How important Mr. Lawrence deems the controlling foot-note, his article shows. He will refer, with particularity, to books he has not read, and perhaps has never seen. Of course, this kind of "science" is sure to confound a man when least he expects it; but the scholarly habit is commendable, even when abused.

Through Mr. Lawrence, who has profitably exploited the field of "scientific" history for many years, we trace the development of Mr. Winsor back to Mr. Aaron Goodrich, the founder of the North American "scientifico-critical" anti-Columbus school. Of his historical grandfather, Mr. Winsor speaks slightly. Not only does he join Mr. Goodrich's name with that of the "canonizer," de Lorgues, but he says that Goodrich entered upon his work with the determined purposed of making a scamp of the *great* discoverer of America.² And pray what was Mr. Winsor's purpose?—unless Mr. Harris should discover that our author had no purpose at all. "They each" (de Lorgues and Goodrich) "in their twists, pervert and emphasize every trait and every incident to favor their views." And we add that "he each," in his twists, like Mr. Lawrence, in his twists, is chargeable with the same perversion. Goodrich's book, like that of de Lorgues, is "absolutely worthless as an historical record," and "has probably done little to make proselytes," writes Mr. Winsor. Poor Mr. Winsor forgets that he will say of Irving that "he does not know when he is criticizing himself."

Mr. Goodrich had more brains than Mr. Winsor, and perhaps, as nice a conscience. Saying all that his critic says against Columbus, Goodrich said something more. Mr. Winsor pictures a scamp for us; but he lacks the courage of Goodrich, who carried the "scientific" method to a logical conclusion. Were he to edit his critic's volume, he would cut out all the "seems" and "perhaps," leaving a thinner book, as well as the mean scamp that Mr.

¹ *Vide Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, May, 1892, pp. 728-740.

² Winsor, p. 60.

Winsor would have "limned," were he as "scientific" as either Goodrich, or Lawrence. As the school evolves, it is not, apparently, the fittest that survive.

The spirit which directed Mr. Winsor in his undertaking, and the peculiar qualities of his critical mind, will be the better appreciated through some helpful quotation. Speaking of the French biographies of Columbus, "which have been aimed to prepare the way for the canonization of the great navigator, in recognition of his instrumentality in carrying the cross to the New World," the American says that they emphasize the missionary spirit of Columbus. "That, in the spirit which characterized the age of discovery, the voyage of Columbus was, at least in profession, held to be one primarily for that end does not, certainly, admit of dispute. Columbus himself, in his letter to Sanchez, speaks of the rejoicing of Christ at seeing the future redemption of souls. He made a first offering of the foreign gold by converting a mass of it into a cup to hold the sacred host, and he spent a wordy enthusiasm in promise of a new crusade to wrest the holy sepulchre from the Moslems . . . Professions, however, were easy; faith is always exuberant under success, and the world, and even the Catholic world, learned as the ages went on, to look upon the spirit that put the poor heathen beyond the pale of humanity as not particularly sanctifying a pioneer of devastation. It is the world's misfortune when a great opportunity loses any of its dignity; and it is no great satisfaction to look upon a person of Columbus's environments and find him but a creature of questionable grace."¹ Incredible as it may appear, the author of the balderdash just quoted, criticizing Hubert Howe Bancroft's rehearsal of the story of Columbus, writes that: "It is, unfortunately, not altogether chaste in its literary presentation."² O vestal Winsor! Thou almost too chaste literary presentator! Would that thou hadst never compelled us to assault thy virginal coign of vantage!

The mission of Columbus is certain, indisputable, "at least in profession." The last four words are wholly "scientific." The discoverer mentioned Christ and the redemption of souls in one of his letters. This is true; but it is also true that he made the same mention in many of his writings; as it is also true that the sovereigns made like mention in several of their writings. These facts have to do with the question. Why does Mr. Winsor scientifically suppress them? Why the idiotic: "faith is always exuberant *under* success," and the drivel about the spirit that did not "particularly sanctify a pioneer of devastation?" From the whole

¹ Winsor, pp. 52-53.

² Winsor, p. 55.

quotation a ready guess possesses our mind that Winsor's Columbus is to be a hypocrite, a pioneer of devastation, and, like all scamps, a creature of questionable grace.

After a time we are told that "Columbus was chronically given to looseness of statement." Mr. Winsor does not tell the truth about Columbus in this sentence; but, inserting his own name in place of the name of Columbus, Mr. Winsor will have made an honest confession. We have passed over one of his falsifications. Now we call attention to it. The French biographies to which he refers have *not* "been aimed at preparing the way for the canonization of the great navigator." How could any one, other than Mr. Winsor, aim a biography at preparing a way? The French biographies were written to correct the misstatements, the calumnies which certain Americans would revive. The French writers could not but emphasize the missionary spirit of Columbus. That spirit is certain; and only a coward would try to rob the discoverer of the glory he has won through his apostolic zeal.

However, when Mr. Winsor aimed at preparing his own dreary way, he aimed around a corner, as we know from the following quotation: "In 1501, his mind—the mind of Columbus—was verging on irresponsibility. He had a talent for deceit, and sometimes boasted of it, or at least counted it a merit." In the name of sense, what is the meaning of "verging on irresponsibility?" Let us answer for the author. In order to make a scamp of Columbus, it is necessary that Mr. Winsor should have the most perfect freedom in loose statement. To have this freedom, he feels it necessary to charge Columbus with looseness of statement and with deceit. Thus the author can accept or reject the words of Columbus, wherever the author pleases. Furthermore, the supernatural is especially emphasized,—and so emphasized that a "critic" cannot cover it, avoid it,—in the writings of Columbus after 1500. Hence the importance of "verging" him on irresponsibility in 1501 at least. The discriminating Mr. Winsor, as best suits his purpose, will thus be free, at the proper date, to make the discoverer responsible and irresponsible on the same page. Clever Mr. Winsor! This must be "science"; but suppose your critics should grow to grasp your scheme!

The maladroitness author has, presumably, fixed upon 1501 as the date of the "verge" of Columbus; but, in fixing upon this date Mr. Winsor did not protect himself sufficiently. Telling the story of Columbus and the so-called Junta of Salamanca, he lauds the Genoese because he "stood manfully for the light that was in him."

¹ Winsor, p. 83.

Promptly, however, we are advised of "those pitiful aberrations of intellect which, *in the years following*, took possession of him, and which were constantly reiterated with painful and maundering wailing." The Junta of Salamanca met in the winter of 1486-1487; and here we have a statement that the aberrations "took possession" of Columbus in the years following. We are no longer bound by the date 1501. Of course this method of writing history may be scientific; but it is not a common-sense method. It is the method of Mr. Lawrence as exemplified in his doomsful "Mystery."

Notwithstanding the pitiful aberrations "of the years succeeding," Columbus won over the queen five years after the meeting at Salamanca. Listen to Mr. Winsor's blank verse: "The Christian banner of Spain floated over the Moorish palace. The kingdom was alive in all its provinces." What a kingdom it must have been! "Congratulation and jubilation, with glitter and vauntings pervaded the air." We have a Milton among us. "Columbus was indeed to succeed; but his success was an error in geography, and a failure in policy and morals."³ The beautiful "but!" Need we add that Columbus never wrote a sentence that showed as great aberration of intellect, as does the sentence we have taken from Mr. Winsor.

"When," after the second voyage, "Columbus landed at Cadiz (June 11, 1496), he was clothed with the robe and girdled with the cord of the Franciscans. *His face was unshaven*. Whether *this* was in penance, or an assumption of piety to serve as a lure is not clear. Oviedo says it was to express his humility, and his humbled pride needed some such expression."⁴ At length we have some truly scientific history. To Mr. Winsor an apology is due. He has confounded us with an original idea,—the idea of an unshaven face in penance, or serving as a pious lure. The man whose success was an error in geography, undoubtedly "needed some such expression." True Science! unshaven, humbly, unluringly, we beg your pardon.

After this experience we cannot feel surprised when Mr. Winsor repeatedly charges Columbus with wiliness. "His artfulness never sprang to a new device so exultingly as when it was a method of increasing the revenue at the cost of the natives."⁵ Now this is lucid, and the figure is sweet and lovable; but we opine that the character of Columbus would be more completely understood of the people, were some one of our artists to treat this subject in chiaroscuro, and exhibit his work at the coming Chicago Expo-

¹ Winsor, p. 164.

² Winsor, p. 176.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 325.

⁵ Winsor, p. 371.

sition: "Columbus's Artfulness Exultingly Springing At a New Device." By the way, this is Mr. Winsor's second original thought. Penitentially unshaven, we must, we shall remain.

The aberration of Columbus we know something of; and it is now time that we learned of a worse disorder which the critical school has diagnosed. He was subject to hallucinations. Indeed, according to Mr. Winsor, when the discoverer was not aberrating, he was hallucinating. "His mind was not unfrequently, in no fit condition to ward off hallucination." Now, as we gather from our scientist, the agonies of such spirits are painful. How painful, he tells us in moving words: "It is far easier to let one's self loose into the vortex and be tossed with sympathy." And now, patient readers, may we not ask you to let yourselves loose into the vortex,—say for five minutes,—and be tossed with sympathy for the critical Mr. Winsor? He needs vortices of the most tossful sympathy. Were it not that he is so acutely discriminating, we should describe him, in his own dialect, as "in large part tumultuous, incoherent, harrowing, weakening and sad,"—"an exultant and bewildered being, singularly compounded."

Our critic considers it fortunate, as we do, that during the latter years of his life Columbus wrote a number of letters. Mr. Winsor values these letters because, with their aid, he can trace the various mental moods of the discoverer. How a great critic estimates these valuable documents may be inferred from the following sentence: "They have in their entirety a good deal of that haphazard jerkiness tiresome to read, and not easily made evident in abstract." If this be so, then Mr. Winsor is *the* man, among all men, fated to jerk the tiresomeness out of their entirety, and to make it haphazardly evident in abstract and in concrete. Honestly, we have labored to take Mr. Winsor seriously; but who could? No one, we are certain, unless it be the undazed historian's self.

Hoping for an "increase of revenue at the cost of the natives," many writers have ventured to compose "history" in the serious or in the comic vein. It would be unfair to suggest that the "scientific" school could be influenced by a motive so veritably mundane. What then could have tempted our author to write his book? If we except himself, Lawrence and Goodrich; if we consult those who, from Bernaldez to Goodrich, told the story of Columbus, we find among honorable, intelligent and studious men, a remarkable agreement as to the ability and character of the discoverer of America. He was a genius; a man of high mind, of great soul, of extraordinary sensibility, gifted with quick percep-

¹ Winsor, p. 461.

tion, with the imagination of a poet, with rare patience, with splendid courage. Add to these admirable qualities his earnest, humble faith in Christ, his devout habits, his zeal in the cause of religion, his loyalty to his adopted country, and certainly he grows not less but greater. And thus all men, who know in what true greatness consists, have judged. Why should Mr. Winsor have wasted effort, seriously or humorously—but in either case, maunderingly—in the attempt to fill in a scant outline with colors that limn a spirit-of-his-age hypocrite, an exuberant pioneer of devastation, a talented deceiver, of questionable grace, an unshaven lure, an aberrating hallucinator, and a successful geographical error? Only “science” dare answer: “True science, which places no gratulations higher than its own conscience.”¹

Quoting from Mr. Winsor, we shall let science speak for herself. “To find illustrations in any inquiry is not so difficult if you select what you wish, and discard all else, and the result of this discriminating accretion often looks very plausible.” Discriminating! We think we have already heard the word out of Mr. Winsor’s mouth. And now that science is on our side, we feel encouraged to say that he is only an accretor and a selecting discarder—though not plausible. Let us follow the accretor as he “finds illustrations” in his “inquiry” about Columbus. De Lorgues is the subject of Mr. Winsor’s criticism. Thus he writes: “Every act and saying of the Admiral capable of subserving the purpose in view are simply made the salient points of a career assumed to be holy. Columbus was in fact of a piece, in this respect, with the age in which he lived. The official and officious religious profession of the time belonged to a period which invented the Inquisition and extirpated a race in order to send them to heaven.”² This passage might be quoted under the “comicalities,” or the “idiocies” of Mr. Winsor. We quote it here to show his hatred of the faith of Columbus, his ignorance of that faith, and his calumniating spirit. In the age in which Columbus lived, calumniators often felt the lash, and fools, in or out of the court, were not always spared because they wore a cap and jingled bells.

And now let us “discriminate” with our scientist while he portrays in our presence a mundane verity who was “of a piece” with Columbus—a yard-stick figure!—and of the age in which he lived—King Ferdinand. “If the Pope regarded him from Italy, *that* Holy Father called him pious. The modern student finds him a bigot.” The modern “student,” be sure, is our accretor. “His subjects thought him great and glorious, *but* they did not see his dispatches, nor know his sometimes baleful domination in his cabi-

¹ Winsor, p. 177.² Winsor, p. 129.³ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

net. The French would not trust him. The English watched his ambition. The Moors knew him as their conqueror." Great minds had the Moors! "The Jews fled before his evil eye. The miserable saw him in his inquisitors. *All* this pleased the Pope, and the papal will made him, in preferred phrase, His Most Catholic Majesty." . . . Discard the animus shown against the papacy, and the quotation is valueless, except as a further example of Mr. Winsor's painful maundering. But he will not cease until he has emphasized his ignorance as well as his prejudice. Ferdinand "did not extort money; he only extorted agonized confessions. He said masses, and prayed equally well for God's benediction on evil as on good things. He made promises, and then got the papal dispensation to break them." Justin! Justin! Is there a Justin Fulton? Then there are two of them.

Mr. Winsor's book, we judge, has been adapted so that, should the occasion offer, it may be advertised as a sequel to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." In and out of season, the question of slavery is made an excuse for another dreary page. An example of the rhetoric, we give with a purpose. "The contemporary history of that age may be said to ring with the wails and moans of such Negro and Moorish victims. A Holy religion had unblushingly been made the sponsor for such a crime. Theologians had proved that the Word of God could ordain misery in this world, if only the recompense came—or be supposed to come—in a passport to the Christian's heaven."¹ Perhaps "Science" can lie as fast as a horse can trot. If so, then "Science" wrote the words we have quoted.

We have some notion, now, of Mr. Winsor's measure of the age in which Columbus lived, and of the "light that was in him." The "completed truth" is yet to come. "That Columbus was a devout Catholic, according to the Catholicism of his epoch, does not admit of question, but when tried by any test that finds the perennial in holy acts, Columbus fails to bear examination. He had nothing of the generous and noble spirit of a conjoint lover of man and of God, as the higher spirits of all times have developed it. There was no all-loving Deity in his conception. His Lord was one in whose name it was convenient to practice enormities. He shared this subterfuge with Isabella *and the rest*."² And with due reverence to Our Lord, we ask, what kind of a Lord can he be, that this convenient utterer of shameless enormities claims as his? For him, it were a charity to say, what, calculatingly, he says of Columbus: "There is no excuse but the plea of insanity."³

The doltish ignorance of this perennial "higher spirit" of our

¹ Winsor, pp. 160, 161.

² Winsor, p. 505.

³ Winsor, p. 311.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 511.

time, was exhibited in the statement that Columbus made an offering of a cup to hold the sacred "host." For the sacraments of the Catholic Church, confession, the holy communion, extreme unction, he shows that unreasoning hate, which betokens a spirit less pardonable than ignorance. The clergy he calumniates, not hesitating to embody in his text suggestions that are basely made, because wholly unfounded.¹ To lie by suggestion, in the name of a Deity, is perhaps to be all-loving, in Mr. Winsor's conception; but in the conception of ordinary men, the lie suggestive is the meanest of lies. 'Mr. Winsor's "unstinted denunciatory purpose," to use his own eloquent words about Mr. Goodrich, is "much weakened by an inconsiderate rush of disdain";² but none the less should his purpose and his ignorance be exposed. He pretends to write the life of a Catholic, and to present a picture of an age wholly Catholic, while knowing of Catholicity no more than a Carib. Go to school, sir! and when you can write clean sentences, take, if you please, to cataloguing books! The ignorance and hate of Lawrence and of Goodrich will be perennial without you. The scientific Mr. Huxley, whose pretentiousness you affect, some Catholics may take seriously; but a counterfeit of his protoplasmic Bathybius even though it develop into the form of a librarian, they will remorselessly, smilingly stew into nothingness.

A passion for "completed truth" compels us to make still another extract from our "subterfugeous" author. The year 1501, he first fixed as the date of the discoverer's hallucination. Then the years following 1486-87 were mentioned as years of aberration. These aberrations and hallucinations were made out of whole cloth, by Mr. Winsor, in order that he might, in a wily way, diminish the credit of Columbus, and yet partly conceal Mr. Winsor's unbelief in the supernatural. However, a man of his little wits finds it much easier to be wily than to be wise, as the following paragraph demonstrates: "He naturally lost his friends with losing his manly devotion to a cause. I do not find the beginning of this surrender of his manhood earlier than in the will which he signed *February 22, 1498*, when he credits the Holy Trinity with having inspired him with the idea that one could go to the Indies by passing westward."³ The murder is out! And we have detected the motive that prompted a tame librarian to attempt to assassinate the character of Christopher Columbus. In his ignorant hate of the Catholic religion, he would make it appear, at one time, that an incomparable genius was mad, because he expressed his belief in the supernatural, and at another time, that this genius unmanned himself by crediting the Holy Trinity—that lives and

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 362, 490, 508, among others.

² Winsor, p. 504.

³ Winsor, p. 511.

reigns forever, without end,—with having inspired him with the idea of seeking a new world. There we have the American scientific-critical school, body and bones, limned in truest proportion by one of its most learned, intellectual and artistic representatives! An abiding faith in the Holy Trinity unmans! On the same page with this atrocious expression of unbelief, it is fitting that a Catholic, in the name of believers, should laud the Trinity that the Catholic Columbus always venerated and loved: Praise be to the Most Holy Trinity, for the inspiration mercifully vouchsafed to the humble Genoese; and for the inspirations daily vouchsafed to men of faith!

Whether Mr. Winsor be a serious or a comic historian, we have his measure of bigotry, imbecility, impertinence, ignorance, williness, and "flagrant disregard of truth." The spirits of Irving, Prescott, von Humboldt, may rest peacefully. Paraphrasing his own words, true historical science has written Mr. Justin Winsor's epitaph: He was a blunderer; his blunder was a book; the book is his monument!¹

Mr. Charles Kendall Adams, formerly President of Cornell University, and who recently, we believe, was transferred to a western college, is responsible for a work, in every way more modest than Mr. Winsor's.² From the pages of Mr. Adams it would not be difficult to make a collection of sentences almost as laughable as Mr. Winsor's. However, the book is much less bad than the "scientist's," and, having said this, there is nothing more to be said in its favor. Indeed, without being brilliant, a writer could have made the "Christopher Columbus" of the ex-President of Cornell out of the Librarian's volume. The book shows signs of haste, not pardonable in a biographer who identifies himself with "modern research." We find a reference to a historian, Von Concelos by name. Perhaps modern research has modified the old form, Vasconcelles, or *ellos*. And we read at least ten times of one "Agnado." The antique school called this: Aguado. Of course, the proof-reader is to blame; but a writer who pretends to judge a great man should be careful lest, through evident carelessness in his work, he give a reader cause to doubt his thoroughness. Mr. Adams will acknowledge that, since Luther's coming, the world has grown more "critical." By the way, the friar who befriended Columbus was known to his contemporaries as Perez, and not as Parez. Finical, if you please; but then there are "eternal verities," as Mr. Adams suggests. Shall we not apply them to him?

¹ Winsor, p. 512.

² *Christopher Columbus, His Life and His Work*. New York. 1892.

³ Adams, p. 73.

Mr. Adams is clumsy, but not bitter. He is not so illogical as Mr. Winsor, though his mind was evidently formed in the same school. In statement and in judgment, he is apt to be contradictory. The religious motive of Columbus he does not hide; yet he quietly puts it aside and seeks to minimize it and him by the stock suggestion of "a distracted, if not an unbalanced mind." Indeed, we are inclined to enter the name of Mr. Adams on the roll of the "scientific" school. Mr. Harris has claimed that if Columbus had not discovered America in 1492, some one else would have discovered it on a certain day some eight years later. Mr. Winsor's mind saltated at this charmingly critical and logical argument, and Mr. Adams also makes it his own. Through an oversight, we neglected to say that, like Mr. Winsor, Mr. Adams is his own authority. He mentions other writers, but always without reference. This method facilitates historical composition, as it permits the composer to introduce quotations from authorities, regardless of the application which the quoted texts have in the original. A shrewd Frenchman said that, having eight lines of anybody's handwriting, it was an easy matter to ruin the writer. How easy it should be then to ruin Columbus, out of a "haphazard" compilation from eighty volumes written by other men! Mr. Adams sins particularly in his quotations from Las Casas, an author who has been sadly abused by all the "scientists." Beyond the misapplication of quotations, we regret to say that, in the translation of texts, Mr. Adams occasionally violates the "eternal verities." However, as we understand the matter, he is their private keeper, and doubtless is entitled to handle them according to his own sweet will.

As evidence substantiating our view that Mr. Adams belongs to the "scientific" school, and as proof that we do not misjudge his logical powers, we shall make a few short extracts from his volume. Having set forth, somewhat weakly, a certain number of hypotheses which lead him to think that Columbus did only what some one else might have done afterwards, Mr. Adams says: "But none of these facts should detract from the credit of Columbus. The great man of such a time is the one who shows that he knows the law of development, and, bringing all possible knowledge to his service, works with a lofty courage and an unflagging persistency and enthusiasm for the object of his devotion, in accordance with the strict laws of historical sequence. Such was the method of Columbus."¹ Mr. Adams may be able to develop sense out of this curious concatenation of the different parts of speech; but others will not be so fortunate. What is the "law of development" of "*such a time*?" And how is a man to know

¹ Adams, p. 33.

this law, which we may imagine to be in the same box with the "eternal verities," and thus hidden from profane eyes? The use of the term "law of development" marks Mr. Adams as an evolutionary factor in the American school of "scientific" historians—a school easily distinguishable by its use of meaningless terms and by a splendid contempt for the great "law of intelligibility." What are "the strict laws of historical sequence," of which Mr. Adams makes mention? They must also be in the "verities" box. Why will not our "historian" favor the world with an English version of these important laws? The idea of Columbus knowing the law of development and then working methodically according to the laws of historical sequence, is worthy of Mr. Winsor himself. There is a law of common sense, which, if Mr. Adams will master it, may keep him from writing "bosh."

And there is another law, the great law of logical sequence, of which this keeper of the eternal verities has never heard, perhaps. A test of his logical power, critical acumen, and hence of his fitness for the office of an historian, can be made by analyzing a few sentences taken from his book. "It is not easy to establish a standard by which to judge of a man whose life was in an age that is past. In defiance of all scholarship, the judgments of critics continue to differ in regard to Alexander, Julius Cæsar, and even Frederick the Great and Napoleon."¹ Why, in the second of these sentences, does Mr. Adams put the words "and even?" In the first sentence he has stated a general proposition: "It is not easy to fix a standard by which to judge a man who died before our time. To this proposition we agree, with many qualifications. The argument, however, is that of Mr. Adams. Frederick, Napoleon, are as dead as Julius Cæsar. Their ages have passed. Therefore, it is not easy to fix a standard by which to judge "of" them. The "and even" is out of place; it means nothing more than that the thought of Mr. Adams is not clear. Next we take the words: "In defiance of all scholarship." They are out of place. The general proposition of Mr. Adams implies that, with or without scholarship, it is not easy to judge a man of a past age, and hence that critics will differ about dead men. Therefore, the differences of the critics are not "in defiance of scholarship." It is Mr. Adams who is defiant of logic. Several trains of thought were running through his mind. He should have switched them on to their respective tracks. Not doing so, a collision occurred and a wreck, not creditable to him.

However, at times, the best of men will make a mistake. To judge "of" the logical or illogical habits of Mr. Adams from two

¹ Adams, p. 251.

sentences only would not be fair. We shall quote the sentence following the two quoted above: "On the one hand, nothing can be more unjust than to bring to the judgment of the present age a man whose activities were exerted amid surroundings and influences that have long since changed and passed away; while, on the other, nothing is more unsafe than to regard the opinions of contemporaries as the just and final judgment of humanity." Between this sentence and the preceding sentence, beginning, "In defiance of scholarship," there is no connection. Nor is there a logical connection between it and the sentence beginning, "It is not easy." Probably, Mr. Adams imagined that he was developing his original proposition, but his error is apparent. Now, if we take the new sentence as it is, and analyze it, we find a form that implies the balancing of things alike or unlike: "On the one hand," "On the other hand." And yet there is no resemblance or contrast, between "injustice" and "unsafeness." A backward child might be pardoned for writing after this fashion, using forms regardless of sense and words regardless of their meaning or relation, but a "scientific" historian should do better.

The ideas expressed in the sentence last quoted deserve a moment's attention. We shall try to state them clearly. First, it is unjust to judge a man of a past age by the judgment of our age. We guess at the writer's meaning, and we might reasonably say yes, or no, to the proposition. Coming, however, to the "other hand" clause of the sentence, we cannot pass it without exposing its unsafeness. To regard the opinions of contemporaries as the just and final judgment of humanity is not safe, says Mr. Adams. An opinion is not a certainty, we agree; but, Mr. Adams has been speaking of judgments, and the word "opinions" is out of place. Let him stick to his text. If he meant to say that it is unsafe to accept the judgments of contemporaries as just and final, not only did he mean to state an untruth, but we shall prove his error by his own words. It *is* safe to regard as just and final the judgments of informed, honest, disinterested contemporaries who knew the person about whom, and the facts about which, they express a judgment. With his little hatchet, Mr. Adams would surreptitiously cut down the primeval oaks of tradition, and with a lean pen-handle he would overturn the rock of certitude, firm-based in the testimony of men and of the senses. It is always unsafe to accept as just and final the judgment of one not competent to judge; and safely we claim that Mr. Adams is too "scientific," and not logical enough, to form sound judgments "of" facts or thoughts.

The author continues: "Between these two dangers we must seek the basis of a judgment in those eternal verities which are

applicable to every age. Since civilization began, good men have ever recognized certain principles of right and justice as applicable to all men and all times."¹ Here we have another bit of "scientific" phraseology: "Since civilization began," and it is meaningless. We are not surprised that Mr. Adams, unsuspectingly, upsets his own nice little illogical argument. It is unsafe, he said, to regard the "opinions" of contemporaries as just and final. And now he tells us that there are "eternal verities" applicable to every age. These eternal verities, we presume, are the principles of right and wrong, which good men have, for an indefinite period, considered applicable to all men and all times. The eternal verities have necessarily existed in each age, and have been applicable in each age. And good men have applied them in each age. Perhaps Mr. Adams holds that, in certain ages, there were no good men; but, until he establishes the fact, we shall maintain that, by his own thoughtless words, he proves that contemporary opinions, based on the principles of right and wrong, may be just and final. How can it, then, be unsafe to regard just judgments as just and final judgments as final? However good Mr. Adams may be, according to the standard of his age, he is a loose reasoner, too illogical, too confused, to be a safe judge of men of any age.

The "eternal verities" of Mr. Adams are summed up in three questions, applicable to all men and all time: "Did his life and his work tend to the elevation of mankind? If so, did these results flow from his conscious purpose? If temporary wrong and injustice were done, were these accessory to the firmer establishment of those broad principles which must underly all security and happiness?" What a mean set of eternal verities Mr. Adams had in the box! Good enough, no doubt, for an evolutionary "scientist"; but imagine a Christian historian thus poorly equipped with "principles of right and wrong!" Not a word of God, of law, of duty! The first "If" reminds one of Mr. Winsor's "successful error" in geography, and might be remodelled in this way: If his life and work tended to the elevation of mankind, was it not by mistake? The second "If" evidences a sublime conception of the principle of right and wrong; and is, neither more nor less than an affirmation that: The end justifies the means. The "conscious purpose" of the previous question might well have been transferred to this one. Neither conscious wrong, nor conscious injustice, can be construed as right under any circumstances, or in any age; even if a claim be made that the wrong or the injustice were "necessary to the firmer establishment of those *broad* principles which must underlie all security and happiness."

¹ Adams, p. 252.

We need not be surprised if we find this "broad-principle" historian freely applying his three "eternal verities" to Columbus. In a halting, uncertain way, he adopts the story so handsomely told by Mr. Eugene Lawrence, of the discoverer's early career as a pirate. Speaking of the French Vice-Admiral Coulom,¹ called by the Venetians, Colombo, Mr. Adams shows his lack of acquaintance with the matter, by saying that "the state-papers of the time uniformly refer to the elder of these commanders as "the Pirate Columbus."² We challenge Mr. Adams to prove this statement. Mr. Harrissee puts the whole case so clearly that no respectable historian can mention the piratical tale except to deny it. However, if Mr. Adams prefers to stand with those learned authorities, Lawrence and Goodrich, the eternal verities will be in good company.

Of the Catholic religion, Mr. Adams is quite as ignorant as Mr. Winsor. Fortunately, the limits of his book do not allow him full play. His judgment of Columbus is "of a piece" with that of the chaste New England stylist. The discoverer was greedy; a wicked slave-trader; indeed, quite "a man of his time." This is the cant of the whole "scientific school." And yet, compared with Mr. Winsor, the ex-president of Cornell University is kind to Columbus. Twice he calls him a "harbinger." We quote one of these tributes on account of its beauty: 'Columbus kindled a fire in every mariner's heart. That fire was the harbinger of a new era, for it was not to be extinguished.'³ Lest the new era may be casually extinguished, we suggest to Mr. Adams that, presently, he drop his eternal verities, with the other rubbish, into the fires of several mariners' hearts,—as a harbinger.

From Irving and Prescott to Goodrich, Lawrence, Winsor and Adams, the descent is painfully notable. The older men were not Catholics, and therefore studied the great Catholic genius, and a Catholic age and country, under serious disadvantages. But being honest men, who recognized the truth of Christian principles, they approached their work with honest intent, with a due sense of responsibility, and with a measure of justice, which though imperfect, was but a little short of the true measure. The judgment of Prescott,—a judgment which every unprejudiced and intelligent student of the life of Columbus must accept,—Mr. Winsor has politely quoted for us. Comparing it with the drivel of Winsor, or the obfuscations of Mr. Adams, Americans must blush for shame that, among them, the name "historian" should be to-day so unwarrantably misused and abused.

¹ Called also Coulon, Colon, and Coullon; his true name was Guillaume de Casenove. See Harrissee, *Les Colombo de France et d'Italie*, pp. 180 et seq.; and *Major's Letters*, p. xxxviii.

² Adams, p. 9.

³ Adams, p. 257.

Mr. Irving's "Observations on the character of Columbus," based as they are on serious and unbiased study, and agreeing, as they do, with Mr. Prescott's conclusions, will always deserve and receive credit.¹ If Mr. Irving accused the discoverer of "superstition and bigotry," we feel that the writer's error was chargeable to a defect of vision, of which he was not conscious, and for which therefore, he should not be harshly condemned. As, with much learning, patience and art, Mr. Irving established, Columbus was a great man, in whom "the practical and the poetical were singularly combined;" a man of learning and a daring genius "whose conclusions even when erroneous were ever ingenious and splendid;" a sagacious man, quick of mind and lucid. He was unselfish. He was not avaricious. Ambitious he was, "with an ambition truly noble and lofty, instinct with high thought, and prone to generous deed." His views were grand, his spirit was magnanimous. A wise ruler, with a sound policy and liberal views, he desired to be a civilizer of men. By nature a sensitive, a passionate man, he trained himself to patience, to forbearance. Forgiving, he forgot. Nature he loved with the enthusiasm of a poet; and poetlike, he was frank in the expression of all the emotions that swept over his impressionable soul. "He was devoutly pious, religion mingled with the whole course of his thoughts and actions, and shone forth in his most private and unstudied writings." "His language was pure and guarded." "An ardent and enthusiastic imagination threw a magnificence over his whole course of thought"; and yet his nature "was controlled by powerful judgment and directed by an acute sagacity." From "the cares of penury, the neglect of a fickle public, the injustice of an ungrateful king, this wonderful man suffered bitterly." But the grandeur of his work is visible to all men. "Nations and tongues and languages have filled the earth with his renown; and to the latest posterity his name shall be revered and blessed."

In Washington Irving's analysis of the character of Columbus, there is not one word of exaggeration. To know the discoverer of America, is to admire him, to love him, to sympathize with him. How can one admire and love without warmly defending him against enemies old or new? Admirable and lovable, he deserves not only defense but also praise. Not even an honest pagan could refuse him laudation. To youth and age he may, he should be presented as an exemplar of manhood; and, with deliberation, we have called his calumniators "spiritless men."

The glory of Columbus was greater than Prescott or Irving

¹ *The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. Hudson edition, vol. ii., pp. 584-596.

could appreciate. Only a Catholic can know, can feel the greatness of the Discoverer's soul. In the face of the American "scientific" school of historians, it is not important that we should state the claims of Leo XIII. to intellectuality, to learning, to a rare knowledge of men's minds and hearts. Perhaps the librarian, or the ex-university President, or even Mr. Lawrence might concede that the Pope was neither aberrated nor hallucinated. In Columbus he sees all that Irving saw and something more. What the Pope sees, he states precisely. "Columbus aimed first of all to propagate the name of Christian and the benefits of Christian charity in the West. As a fact, as soon as he presented himself to the sovereigns of Spain, he explained the cause for which they were not to fear taking a warm interest in the enterprise, as their glory would increase to the degree of immortality if they decided to carry the name and the doctrines of Jesus Christ into such distant regions." "Certain as he was of tracing out and of preparing the way of the Gospel, and fully absorbed in his thought, he caused all his actions to converge to it, not undertaking anything of any kind but under the shield of religion, and with the escort of piety." Doubling the world, spreading civilization and riches, and benefits innumerable, he is worthy of all honor; but honorable above all because "of his subservience and knowing obedience to the *divine project*."¹ "Elevation of heart, the spark of genius come from God only, their author and preserver." The Discoverer's acknowledgment that the Holy Trinity had inspired his work, was a Christian's humble acknowledgment of a patent fact.

The contemptible books recently written about Columbus make plain the defective scholarship, the lamentable want of logic, the low order of mind, the imperfect education of certain writers, who push themselves upon or who are pushed upon the public. Among the educated their books can do no harm; but among the uneducated, among the young, the evil they may cause is incalculable. In the field of history, Catholics should work more earnestly, more laboriously. There the cockle is sown by night. There the seeds of sham science, of false philosophy, of infidelity, are watered and tended as though they were valuable plants. And growing, they kill the fine wheat of truth. To uproot the weeds of error is to do good work. To plant the seed of truth is to do noble work. Awaken, ye sleepers!

JOHN A. MOONEY.

¹ See the letter already referred to.

IS IRISH HOME RULE NEAR?

AFTER six years' rule the Tory Government has been overthrown in the British Empire, and its place has been taken by a ministry pledged to restore self-government to Ireland. For the first time in the century a majority of the British House of Commons has declared itself in favor of Ireland's right to that national government, of which she was deprived by force and fraud at its very beginning. The struggle of the Irish people for self-government has hardly a parallel in history for its persistence. Beginning with Emmett's ill-fated insurrection in 1803, it has continued under varying names down to the present moment. The struggle for Catholic Emancipation was only the prelude to O'Connell's Repeal Agitation, and that movement had no sooner been hushed by the famine and the death of its great leader than it was followed by Young Ireland's appeal to arms, in 1848. The Tenant Right Agitation of Duffy and Lucas took up the struggle only to be broken by the treachery of Kehoe and Sadlier; yet scarcely had the people resigned all hope of success from Parliamentary action than James Stephens essayed a fresh organization for armed insurrection. The Fenian attempted revolt met a similar fate to Emmett's and Smith O'Brien's, and was crushed by the force of the British Empire; but while scores of its followers were yet paying the penalty of their attempt in English and Australian convict cells, their countrymen renewed in Parliament the demand for Home Rule, which now at last has won to its side a majority of the representation of the Empire. Since O'Connell, in 1829, wrested religious freedom from the conqueror of Napoleon, no gleam of success has come to cheer the Irish people in their long national struggle. It has seen three attempted insurrections fail; its country has been wasted by a famine unparalleled in modern history, its numbers have dwindled to little more than a half of what they were fifty years ago; but all through these years the great mass of Irishmen has steadily refused to allow its nationality to be merged in that of its rulers. From the beginning of the Repeal movement down to 1885, the whole body of British Representatives, without distinction of Whig or Tory, of Conservative or Liberal, was united in the determination that the union of the two countries should be maintained at any cost. During much the greater part of that time, owing to the limited extent of the franchise, a majority of the members of Parliament from Ireland united in the same view, but the

spirit of the Irish people has never wavered in the resolution to win back self-government. Dogged perseverance at length has prevailed against the strength of English prejudice. The ablest statesman of the Empire finally acknowledged the justice of Ireland's claims, and his leadership drew the majority of the Liberal party to the same view in 1885. The old race antipathies of the English people were then too powerful to yield at once even to the influence of a Gladstone, and the cry of preserving the union of the Empire carried an aristocratic party, headed by a typical and insolent marquis, into control of the government, despite of the democratic feelings of the mass of English voters. The task of smoothing away those antipathies and of convincing the majority of the people of Great Britain that Irish Home Rule was not only just, but also expedient to the welfare of the empire, has been steadily carried on during the last six years, and the late elections show how successfully. The restoration of a Parliament to Ireland has been accepted in theory by the voters of the Empire. It remains to be seen how and when that restoration is likely to be carried out in practice.

The present time is indeed the most critical period of the century for Ireland's rights. An enormous gain has been made by the return to power of Mr. Gladstone, backed by a Home Rule majority of the House of Commons, but the establishment of an Irish Parliament on satisfactory lines is necessarily a slow and complicated work and the end of the struggle is not as yet. The opponents of Home Rule are a strong minority in the Commons, and they have full control of the House of Lords, which is, in theory, an equal branch of Parliament. Politics in Parliament, as well as elsewhere, are subject to sudden changes from unexpected causes, and English popular feeling, though usually slow in its action, is liable to occasional violent movements. The agitation caused by the nomination of the late Cardinal Wiseman to the Archbishopric of Westminster, and the anti-Irish outburst caused by the dynamite explosions in London, a few years ago, are examples of the liability to sudden panics which has been a feature of the English character since the earliest times. Questions may arise altogether outside of Home Rule, which would seriously divide Mr. Gladstone's followers, and it will need the most careful statesmanship in their leader to prevent the question of Home Rule from being overshadowed by others of less importance. The health of the aged statesman who has taken on himself so bravely the championship of Ireland's right is another cause for anxiety among Ireland's friends. Wonderful as is his vitality, it must not be forgotten that he carries the weight of eighty-four years on his shoulders, and the labor of conducting the government of such

an empire as the British is a herculean task even for the strongest constitution. Thoughts like these are well calculated to prevent any premature exultation in the minds of Ireland's friends at the present moment, and, at the same time, to impress on them the necessity of the highest prudence and unsparing diligence in the coming Parliamentary session. Negligence on the part of the Irish members or some burst of recklessness among unthinking and irresponsible Irishmen may postpone for years the hope of Irish self-government, which now seems so near.

Apart from the general question of securing Home Rule, it is of vital importance that the measure of it granted shall be adequate to the wants of the Irish people. We have every reason to believe Mr. Gladstone is sincere in the wish to secure to the Irish people complete control of their own country, subject only to an Imperial connection with the empire. Examples are not wanting within that empire to-day, of self-governing communities enjoying such a measure of practical independence as would fully satisfy the requirements of the Irish people. Such an autonomy as is possessed by Canada, by New Zealand, or by any of the provinces of Australia, would meet the needs and the national aspirations of Ireland, without imperilling the unity of the British empire. It is not to be supposed that that the majority of Irishmen the world over, feel any enthusiasm for the British connection, but they are willing to accept it loyally, if their country's welfare be made compatible with its existence. Up to the present such has not been the case, and hence the great majority of the Irish race regards England with feelings of deep hostility. In the colonies just mentioned, however, that feeling has well nigh died out, under the influence of self-government, and there is no reason to doubt but such would also be the case in Ireland.

Neither Canada nor Australia, however, is the exact model on which Ireland's future Constitution is to be shaped in Mr. Gladstone's mind. There has been a good deal of talk during the past year over the measure of Home Rule that will be introduced into the present Parliament, and some of the Parnellites have demanded its full particulars from Gladstone, even while he was yet a simple member of Parliament. As a matter of fact, the main outlines of that measure have been before the public for the last five years.

The bill introduced in 1886, with certain changes in the matter of Irish contributions to imperial taxation, in the control of the police force, and probably in the Upper House of the Legislature, and coupled with the retention of the Irish members in the London Parliament, embodies substantially the form of Irish Parliament, which will be now proposed. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone

proposed to place the government of Ireland in all domestic affairs in the hands of an Irish Legislature. That body was to have no share in the administration of the empire at large, in the army or navy, in foreign relations of the empire, or in control of its colonies. It was to pay a fixed contribution to the imperial revenue, for general purposes, differing therein from Canada or Australia. The post-office, the mint and coinage, and the regulation of trade and navigation were also to be reserved to the Imperial Parliament, but on those points the author of the bill professed his readiness to accept changes if deemed desirable. The establishment of a state religion was also forbidden, and, finally, the constabulary force was to remain for a certain time subject to the English administration. The viceroy was to be continued, but not as now, as the representative of each dominant party in Great Britain, but simply as a representative of the sovereign appointed for a term of years, independently of English party changes.

The Irish ministry was to be responsible to the Irish Parliament in the same manner as the Imperial Ministry is to the British Parliament at present, and the functions of the Viceroy would be similar to those performed by the sovereign in the English government. The Lord-Lieutenant might veto the measures of the Irish Parliament, but his ministers would be practically unable to carry on the administration of an unpopular policy against the will of the Legislature. Finally the presence of the Irish members in the Parliament at Westminster was to cease, and the members themselves, with an equal number of elected colleagues, were to constitute the first Irish House of Commons. The twenty-eight peers who now represent the Irish Peerage in the English House of Lords were to be left to choose between seats in either house, and seventy-five additional members of the Upper Chamber were to be elected by a constituency more limited than the general body of voters.

The main points of the constitution thus proposed for Ireland will undoubtedly be retained in the next Home Rule Bill. Since 1886 Gladstone has modified his views by providing for the retention of the Irish representation in the British Parliament. The feeling in Ireland was strongly in favor of the original proposition. It was considered that the country would need the services of experienced legislators in its home legislature more urgently than in the London Parliament; and also that the retirement of Irish representatives from the latter body would increase the relative importance of the Dublin Parliament. There was much force in both arguments, but on the other hand the Irish representation in London is a most important element of security for the Parliament in Dublin. Were the Irish members withdrawn from the present British Parliament, the latter would become Unionist by a majority

of forty. It would have power at once to undo the work of Home Rule and further to cripple Irish influence in imperial affairs by restoring a single Imperial Parliament with an Irish membership diminished to a half or even less. These considerations induced Mr. Gladstone to announce that in his next Home Rule measure the present representation of Ireland will be retained at Westminster. He has also declared himself, though less definitely, in favor of giving the Irish Parliament complete control of the Irish police.

The retention of an Irish representation in the British Parliament and the removal of the Irish police force from the control of the latter body are the most radical changes that will be made in the new Home Rule Bill, as far as can be reasonably foreseen.

There are, however, many important modifications likely to be made in the measure of 1886, either by Mr. Gladstone himself when drafting his new bill, or during its discussion in the House. By the old bill the control of Irish trade and navigation laws, as well as of the Irish post-office, was reserved to the Imperial Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, however, declared that he was ready to modify these provisions if good reasons should be given for such a course at a later time. It would be most desirable that at least the regulation of Irish trade and navigation should be left to the management of the Irish Legislature as well as other Irish affairs. There does not appear any solid grounds for making them a distinct branch of the government, and the possible clashing of different administrations in essentially Irish business should be carefully avoided. The jealousy of English manufacturers and merchants, who apprehend that an Irish Parliament might take up a policy of protection, such as has been adopted by some of the Australian and North American colonies, has undoubtedly been the motive which led Mr. Gladstone to insert this clause in his bill. It is illogical and likely to lead to much subsequent friction between the two countries. The main reason given for the establishment of Home Rule by Mr. Gladstone himself is, that English rule has been disastrous to the interests of Ireland and exasperating to her people. It seems illogical to retain a part of such a system when it has been abandoned as a whole. What the Irish people demand and what their needs require, is full control of their own affairs. There is no good reason why Irish trade and Irish navigation should not be as important as Irish fisheries or Irish agriculture. It would certainly be better for the Irish people to have Home Rule in all other points than none at all, but it would be far more desirable to have it complete rather than marred by arbitrary exceptions. The discussion of these points, however, must be left to the discretion and patriotism of the Irish representatives who, it is to be hoped, will be able to secure the modifications required by their

country's wants, if they can be had without risking the failure of the Home Rule platform as a whole,

A matter of still greater importance is the amount to be paid by Ireland under the new system to the British treasury for strictly imperial purposes. These include the military and naval expenditures, the diplomatic service, the expenses of the crown and general government, and the payment of interest on the national debt. In his former bill Mr. Gladstone proposed that the Irish contribution for these objects should be one-fifteenth of that of the empire; or, in round numbers, seventeen million dollars annually. Though this amount is small in proportion to the relative population of Ireland and Great Britain, it is entirely out of proportion to the relative wealth of the two countries. The relative and even the actual wealth of Ireland has been steadily decreasing under the union. When that measure was passed, the wealth of Ireland was estimated to be two-seventeenths of the whole empire, and its contributions were to be assessed on that basis. Mr. Giffen, the well-known English statistician, in a recent work estimates the present wealth of Ireland at only one-twenty-third part of that of Great Britain. In 1812 the actual value of all property in Ireland was estimated by Mr. Colquhoun, an officer of the Board of Trade, at five hundred and sixty-three millions of pounds. This year Mr. Giffen only puts it at a little over four hundred millions, while he gives the resources of England at eight thousand six hundred millions, or about forty-three thousand million dollars. The average wealth of Englishmen is over twenty times that of the inhabitants of Ireland, including both Dublin and Belfast. At the same time Ireland now pays taxes to the amount of seven million pounds to the treasury, apart from local taxation, or a full twelfth of the whole expenditures of the empire. A system of taxation which extorts double payments from the poorest country in a supposed equal union has contributed enormously to the general decay which has settled on Irish prosperity, apart from the other evils of foreign government. Since the Crimean War the taxes levied from Ireland have been increased over fifty per cent., while the comparative increase in England has been, we believe, little over twelve. It must be remembered that during this period of thirty-six years the actual wealth of Ireland has been steadily diminishing while that of Great Britain has been as steadily growing. Before the famine Ireland was certainly taxed to her full capacity, and the annual amount imposed on her was only about twenty-one million dollars. Since that period her population has shrunk from eight millions and a half to less than five millions, half her cultivated land has been abandoned, and no new source of wealth has been added to her resources, but the taxation extorted from

her by the British government has risen to thirty-five million dollars. We are within bounds in saying that the extra taxation taken from Ireland since the Crimean War equals four hundred million dollars, or nearly double the amount which the late government proposed to advance as a loan for the purpose of buying out the interests of a part of the Irish landlords. This excessive taxation during the last forty years has been, we are convinced, one of the chief causes of Ireland's industrial decay. Its diminution is a matter of necessity. With intelligent self-government the country might be able to bear its present taxation and recover something of the prosperity of the other countries of Western Europe, but it is at least doubtful. It would be within the power of Mr. Gladstone to materially reduce the contribution of Home Rule Ireland to the imperial treasury, and if the case be fairly stated to him by the Irish representatives he probably will do so. The point is a most important one, and it is to be trusted it will not be overlooked in the coming session of Parliament.

A measure of land purchase by which a hundred and eighty million pounds of government debentures secured by the lands purchased and by the national credit were to be issued for the purpose of buying the land of Ireland from its present landlords and transferring it to the tenant-farmers as purchasers from the government at a low rate of interest, accompanied Mr. Gladstone's last Home Rule Bill. This proposal will certainly not be renewed. About a quarter of the amount suggested has been already issued by Lord Salisbury's Government with little practical result except to enable some large proprietors to exchange Irish rents for Government securities. No appreciable result in the general well-being of the country has followed. It is likely that Mr. Gladstone will leave the future settlement of the relations between landlord and tenant to the wisdom of the Irish Parliament. The land question is a most important one, but it is essentially subordinate to that of self-government for the country, and need not be further discussed at this moment.

The kind of self-government which Mr. Gladstone proposes to secure to Ireland has been made sufficiently clear. It remains to consider whether it is sufficient for the needs of Ireland and the national aspirations of Irishmen. If fairly carried into effect we believe it will be found so. It would make Irish interests the interests of Government in Ireland. It would put the laws and their administration in harmony with the sober judgment of the nation in place of being, as they now too often are, in direct opposition both to the popular conscience and the true interests of the country. It would put the legislation and development of public education and of all public works, under control of the Irish peo-

ple, and would give a fair chance of arresting the ruin of all interests in Ireland which has now continued uninterruptedly for forty-five years. It would meet the national sentiment by the restoration of an Irish self-governed nationality which could well afford to dispense with direct relations with other countries if left undisturbed in the management of its own. The fact that Gladstone's original Bill of 1886 was accepted by the entire body of the Irish National Representatives, including their then leader, Mr. Parnell, as a fair substitute for Grattan's Parliament, is the strongest practical evidence that the Home Rule which it proposed is a genuine restoration of Irish National government. The retention of the Irish Representatives in Westminster, was on deliberation, fully approved of by the same parties. Since the late election Messrs. McCarthy, Dillon and Sexton, the leaders of the present Nationalist party, have been in consultation with Mr. Gladstone on the subject of the various modifications in detail to be made in the coming measure, and have expressed themselves fully satisfied that they will be of a nature to enlarge rather than to restrict the control to be given to the Irish people over their own affairs. As far as ordinary human foresight goes the system which Mr. Gladstone will propose will prove as adequate to the requirements of the Irish people as the Repeal demanded by O'Connell and Davis or any other measure short of complete independence that has as yet been proposed for Ireland's government.

It need not be concealed that the difficulties yet to be surmounted before Home Rule can become an actual fact are many.

Gladstone by six years' work has now secured a clear majority in its favor, but the opposition to it is still very strong. In England itself the Tories and the Chamberlain Unionists, who are simply Liberals opposed to the Irish claims, have returned two hundred and sixty-seven members, while the party in favor of justice to Ireland has only one hundred and ninety-eight. It is Wales and Scotland, not England, that have built up Mr. Gladstone's majority, with, of course, the Irish members included. There are many possible accidents that might for a time give the anti-Irish feeling full sway again in England. Such an event as the murder of the late Lord Frederick Cavendish, or the Clerkenwell dynamite explosion, would be quite likely to produce such a result. Even leaving such chances aside, the mere course of Parliamentary proceedings may cause schisms among Mr. Gladstone's supporters; that might overthrow his administration. A British Ministry is unlike an administration in this country, which holds office for a definite number of years. While a term of six years is presented as the limit of a Parliament's duration which cannot be passed, its practical length is determined by the popularity of the ministry in

power. If the latter from any cause, should fail to command a majority in the Commons on some vital measure, it has either to retire or call a new election. A blunder on the part of a minister, is quite capable of wrecking a government under the British system. In Gladstone's present party, while all his supporters are in favor of Home Rule, there are wide divergencies of opinion on other points. A section of the advanced Liberals desire the abolition of the House of Lords and the Established Church, while the majority are unwilling to attempt such radical measures now. The labor question and an eight hour law, are also points on which serious differences exist in the English Liberal party. It is quite possible for Mr. Gladstone to keep his followers together in spite of those differences, but in the course of a session many occasions occur in which private feelings may get the better of party allegiance. Much will depend on the spirit in which the session begins. If Mr. Gladstone can favorably impress his followers by displays of marked ability in the introductory work of Parliament, the popularity of his government will carry away all local grumblers, and insure the support of the country outside.

Should Mr. Gladstone, however, be unable to take a strong attitude, or his subordinates commit any official blunders of importance, the strength of the government might be so reduced that it would be unable to effect its purpose or be forced to appeal to the country. A Parliamentary session is virtually a campaign in which it is not enough for the leader to have superior strength on his side if he does not also use it to the best advantage in every part of the field. The position of the Irish members calls for the highest tact at the present moment as well as the steadiest fidelity to their work. Home Rule is, of course, the great object for which they are in the English Parliament at all, but they must use their position with the utmost prudence in the choice of means to attain it. The greater the strength that Mr. Gladstone can command in Parliament the greater the chances of winning Irish self-government. There will be numerous subjects to occupy attention besides Home Rule during a session, and on those, common sense as well as national gratitude requires that the Irish Nationalists should give every effort to strengthen the hands of the Home Rule Ministry. Some other measures may be brought forward such as the payment of members, the restriction of voting power to one vote for each elector, or other general legislation deemed necessary to strengthen the power of Mr. Gladstone's party. On such, if he should call for the aid of the Irish members it should be given loyally and fully. The Irish members have no need to merge their existence in that of the English Liberals to do this much. Such a policy would be a direct denial of the necessity of Home Rule itself,

but as practical men it is their duty to help by every legitimate means of Parliamentary warfare in maintaining Mr. Gladstone in power, while he upholds the principle of Home Rule. They must avoid frittering away his strength by side issues or personal ambitions and must loyally accept his leadership in the details of the campaign as soldiers obey the commands of a general without demanding an explanation of each movement which he commands. In Parliamentary struggles as in actual warfare, strict discipline, however irksome its restraints, is the first requisite for success. Such a discipline is the most effective aid which the Irish National members can give their country now in the crisis of her struggle for self-government.

It must be confessed that the greatest danger which the cause of Home Rule has lately encountered has arisen from the ranks of the Irish Nationalists themselves. The division which occurred in the Irish Nationalist members when Parnell set his own name against the decision of the majority has been continued after his death by his followers. At a moment when the fate of Ireland as a nation hangs in the balance as never before in the century, a certain number of politicians, professing themselves to be Irish Nationalists, have attempted to divide the forces of the country on purely personal grounds. In all the utterances of the Parnellite party, we have failed to find a single general principle on which division in the Nationalist ranks could be justified. Their leaders had all been elected to Parliament as advocates of Home Rule and had pledged themselves to sit, vote and act with the majority of their party for that end. They had accepted Gladstone's Home Rule Bill of 1886, as a reasonable satisfaction of Ireland's claims and during four years they had supported him strenuously in Parliament and out of it as the man to whose success meant the deliverance of their country, and had commended him as such to the Irish people.

On the occasion of the O'Shea divorce scandal, however, Gladstone as a politician felt obliged to warn his Irish allies that Mr. Parnell's continuance as leader would make it impossible for himself to obtain a majority in favor of Home Rule. This declaration it was his duty as a public leader to make, and the majority of the Irish members in their undoubted right of judgment saw fit to remove Mr. Parnell from the leadership to prevent disaster to the cause of their country. The minority has since broken the hitherto undivided party of Irish Nationalists into two sections on the question of whether the treatment awarded to Parnell was expedient or otherwise. No other point of difference could be discovered between the professed principles of the two sections. Both professed their object to be the attainment of Home Rule on

the general lines of Mr. Gladstone's first bill ; but the minority claimed that it was an equally important matter to take revenge on the opponents of Parnell for his deposition. On this point alone, they divided the Nationalist party of Ireland into two camps in over fifty constituencies at the last election. Five or six seats representing ten or twelve in divisions, were thus handed over to the Tory foes of Irish self-government, and it is alleged with apparent truth, that from ten to twenty other seats were lost in Great Britain, by the forced absence of Irish Home Rule speakers, who were engaged in defending their own seats in purely Nationalist constituencies, while they should have been winning Unionist seats in Great Britain. The final outcome has been that the Parnellites are reduced to insignificance in the house. They have got nine unpledged members out of eighty Irish Home Rulers. Of the Nationalist seats in the late Parliament, two in Dublin and three in Ulster have been captured by the opponents of Home Rule. The actual majority in favor of Home Rule is forty, while it would have been from sixty to ninety, had the Parnellites been willing to accept the principle that in a party organized for a common national object, the will of the majority should be the supreme law. This result has at least one good effect. It has opened the eyes of Irishmen the world over to the dangers of allowing personal feelings or personal allegiance to any man to usurp the place of political principle in the struggle for the common welfare of the Irish nation.

The action of the nine Parnellite members in the coming session may be the most serious danger that Home Rule will have to contend with. It is not too late for them yet to redeem themselves by joining heartily in the Parliamentary struggle for Irish self-government, but if they allow their ill-will towards Mr. Gladstone and the desire, which some of them have expressed, to punish him for his attitude towards Parnell, to sway their votes they may impede very considerably the establishment of Home Rule. Fortunately, their numbers are not sufficient to change his majority into a minority, and the pressure of public opinion in Ireland, as well as, it may be hoped, the national sympathies, which cannot be dead in their own breasts, will probably keep them from going over to the ranks of their country's foes.

As to the nature of the contest to be expected over the Home Rule measure, when introduced into Parliament, its early stages will not differ materially from those of any other important legislative measure. Mr. Gladstone's proposals will be resisted, as a whole, by the Tory and Chamberlain parties with all their strength and strenuous efforts will also be made to modify its details so as to concede as little as possible to the wishes of the Irish people.

If during the debates on Home Rule any occasion should offer for exciting the prejudices of the English people or of any section of Mr. Gladstone's Parliamentary supporters, it will be taken advantage of as fully as the ability of its opponents will permit. Some foreign complication or internal question may temporarily embarrass the Government, and if such should arise it will be at once used as a weapon to prevent the granting of Home Rule. It is on such occasions that the chief danger is to be apprehended from the Irish Parnellites. They may bring forward questions of minor importance on which English prejudice may be excited should Mr. Gladstone concede, or Irish popular feeling if he should reject them. The question of pardoning the men confined in English prisons for real or alleged participation in dynamite outrages is one of this kind which has already been exploited by some of the Parnellite politicians. Now that they are out of power, the Tories would be perfectly willing to vote for the amnesty which they refused persistently while in office, if by so doing they could overthrow the Home Rule Ministry and so secure the maintenance of the Union. The course for all real friends of Ireland is plain. Home Rule is the question of the hour, and to it all others must temporarily be subordinated. Gladstone is the recognized leader of the Home Rule Ministry, and he should receive loyal support from all friends of Ireland in the contest which approaches. In the details of that contest common sense as well as gratitude suggests that his judgment should be respected and his policy supported on all occasions in which dissent is not absolutely necessary. It is quite within reckoning that in many details his line of action may not be that which his Irish supporters would choose, but he must be given the right of a general to regulate his campaign, so long as his fidelity to the Irish cause is sure. That the veteran statesman is really determined to secure Home Rule for Ireland his retirement from office in 1886, rather than abandon it, is the best guarantee that can be given. Magnanimity is a rare quality among the political leaders of any country, and among none more than British statesmen. Gladstone alone, that we can remember, of English ministers, has more than once placed the claims of justice above party interests or national prejudices. He may not have done so always, but he certainly has given striking examples of such conduct twice, before the introduction of the Home Rule Bill. He brought about the cession of the Ionian Islands to Greece a quarter of a century ago, as an act of national justice, and he acknowledged the independence of the Transvaal, in 1879, in defiance of British Jingoism. That he should undo the brutal work of Pitt and restore national government to Ireland at the close of his career,

would be a work to render his name immortal in the love of the Irish people. The future is in the hands of God and man should not presume to foresee it with prophetic vision, unless the prophet's inspiration be accorded from on high. It may safely be said, however, that William Ewart Gladstone has brought the realization of Ireland's dearest hope nearer than it has ever been before. Never, since Sarsfield opened the gates of Limerick to the Dutch invader, and led the last Irish national army away to exile, two hundred years ago, has the Irish people seen a genuine Irish Government within its reach. The Parliament of Grattan and the Volunteers was at best but the government of a small section of the English colonists, naturalized indeed into Irishmen, but who regarded the mass of the Irish nation as the Spaniards of Mexico regarded the Indians, or the West India planters their negro slaves. The Repeal movement, which for two years massed the great body of the Irish Catholic population in a united demand for self-government, made no serious impression on the Parliament or people of England. The determination to maintain the Union at whatever cost was as fixed a dogma of the British political creed for thirty years after O'Connell's death as was the exclusion of Catholics from all share in the British Government during the last century. The change which has since come to pass is extraordinary indeed. This year a majority of the House of Commons, in the hands of which rests, absolutely, the supreme power of the British Empire, has declared itself ready to establish a National Government in Ireland. It is hard to realize how great is the revolution which thus gives the prize for which Sarsfield fought and Lord Edward and Wolfe Tone and Emmett died, for which O'Connell moved the Irish masses as one man in vain, and Davis and Dillon and Mitchell and Duffy poured out their souls. The dream of ages has well nigh come, and Ireland promises in the near future to be "a nation once again."

It is not surprising that Irishmen who for so many generations have grown to regard their struggle for freedom as a duty rather than a hope, should scarcely realize that victory has come within their grasp at last. They have held to their nationality as they held to their religious faith under the penal code, as a question of justice not of expediency—and they can hardly feel as yet that the national thralldom they have borne for centuries is passing away like the intolerance which so long bound their faith. It is all important, however, that they should realize that such is the case, and act accordingly. The present moment is no time for dreaming. It is the very crisis of the fate of Ireland. It calls on the whole Irish race for supreme effort of sacrifice and discipline to achieve the restoration of nationhood. It is not enough for Irishmen,

more than for any other people, to wish to be free. They must actively employ the means necessary to win freedom, and those means now are fully within their own power: Union in the common cause, strict discipline under the chosen leaders of the people, and the sinking of all personal ends or petty dissensions among the people themselves, are the great requisites to make Home Rule a reality. All these rest with Irishmen themselves, and in spite of recent divisions in their ranks, we hope and believe they will not be wanting. That the Parnellite partisans will let their personal feelings prevail over their patriotism, we cannot think. Their cordial reunion with the majority of their countrymen would make the events of the last eighteen months be quickly forgotten. Their opposition might delay Home Rule, but could not prevent it, and between these alternatives it is unreasonable to doubt what their action will be when the next session opens.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

OUR PAROCHIAL SCHOOL SYSTEM—THE PROGRESS IT HAS MADE AND IS MAKING.

SOME time ago certain sweeping assertions were made in an educational review and a number of other periodicals respecting the Catholic parochial school movement. These assertions led up to the false conclusion that our parochial schools are a practical failure so far as their ultimate purpose—the providing of sufficient school facilities for the Catholic children of our country—was concerned. Various figures were given which were entirely fallacious, in that they hugely exaggerated the number of Catholic children in the United States who can reasonably be expected to attend school, and greatly underestimated the proportion of those children that do attend school.

One of these statements went so far as to assert that there are about two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age" in our country, while there are but seven hundred thousand pupils in the Catholic parochial schools.

The inference from this fallacious statement was that less than one-third of the Catholic children in our country attended Catholic schools, and that the remaining two-thirds, or more, either attended the public schools or did not go to school at all.

.It is not our intention, nor is it necessary, to examine these

erroneous statements in detail. We first confine ourself to proving the absurdity of the assertion that in the United States there are two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age." We heartily wish the assertion were true; but true it is not, and the untruth will quickly be seen by every one who has any knowledge of the proportion of children to population. Not to speak of children of "school age," but confining attention simply to children of any age, you cannot, by any fair process of computation, make out that two and a half millions of the nine millions or (if you please) ten millions of practical Catholics in our country are children who are or ought to be at school.

A few figures gleaned from reports of the United States census and from the report of the United States Commissioner of Education conclusively prove the truth of what we have just said. Two millions and a half are almost exactly twenty-seven and eight-tenths per cent. of nine millions, and all the "children" in the United States of from six to seventeen years (both included) are about twenty-seven and eight-tenths per cent. of the entire population of our country. Consequently, to make up two and a half millions of Catholic children of "school age," you must include every Catholic boy and girl from six to seventeen years of age. If you compute the Catholic population of the United States at ten millions, two millions and a half "children" would be about twenty-five per cent. of the Catholic population of our country, and would include every Catholic boy and girl (without even a single exception) from seven to sixteen as children who ought to be at school.

This is a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*. It involves a demand that Catholic parochial schools do more than our "magnificent" "American" public school system has ever done, and, we hesitate not to say, ever will be able to do. We have before us the report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1888-89, the latest that up to this time has been published. According to this report, the total number of children enrolled in all the public schools (primary, grammar and high) from seven years of age to eighteen is just twenty per cent. of the whole population of the United States.

Again, according to these tables, the number of children in the United States between seven and seventeen years of age is almost one-third (more than thirty-two per cent.) of the whole population; but when we inquire for the proportionate number of these children who are in *actual attendance* upon public schools (primary, grammar and high), we learn that they are less than thirteen per cent. (twelve and eight-tenths) of the population. From this it appears that the number of children attending the public schools in proportion to the whole population of our country is less than

is the number of children attending Catholic parochial schools in proportion to the whole Catholic population.

There are other very significant facts that we may learn from the statistics of the United States Commissioner of Education.

Of 7,572,000 pupils in actual attendance upon public schools in the United States (primary, grammar and high), there are only 135,000 in the high schools and 2,062,000 in the grammar schools, leaving 5,375,000 in the *primary* schools. In the face of these facts how little truth is there in the assertion that the public schools are the *people's* schools!

Again, it appears, from these statistics, that of the 7,572,000 pupils in the public schools of the United States 7,000,000 were under thirteen years of age, 275,000 were thirteen, 162,000 were fourteen, leaving only 135,000 pupils in all the public schools in the United States who were over fourteen years of age. In other words, of all the children in the public schools in the United States ninety-two and one-half per cent. are not over thirteen years of age, and ninety-six per cent. are not over fourteen.¹

We have gone into these tedious details not so much for the purpose of dispelling delusive notions that are entertained of the public schools and the work they are doing, as of furnishing a basis of comparison between them and the Catholic parochial schools.

There is still another very significant fact which these tables show. It is this: According to the proportion of persons of different ages to population, as shown by United States census statistics, there were in the year 1889 (the year of which we have given educational statistics taken from the report of the United States Commissioner) eighteen millions of persons in our country of from seven to eighteen years of age. Of these 7,572,000 were in attendance on public schools, primary, grammar and high, or almost exactly forty-two per cent.; or, if you add 800,000 or 850,000 Catholics who are attending Catholic parochial schools and other schools of like character (as we will show), you will have, in the

¹ There seems to be a perfect craze to extend the period of so-called "school age" to its utmost possible limits. The United States Census Superintendent says that in "the published reports of previous censuses statements concerning persons of school age have been limited to 5 to 17 years, both inclusive," but under the present census "results are given covering persons from 5 to 20 years, both years inclusive."

From the same bulletin (dated August 13, 1892) we learn that in twenty-five States of the Union the "school age" includes persons of 21 years of age, and in nine other States it includes persons of 20 years. On the other hand, in five States of the Union "school age" begins at four years; in eighteen States it begins at five years, and in twenty States it begins at six years.

Where is the sense of thus stretching "school age" to impracticable limits, when, of the whole number of children in our public schools, 96 per cent. are between the ages of 7 and 14, and 92½ per cent. are between the ages of 7 and 13?

one case, forty-six per cent. ; in the other you will have forty-nine per cent. of the eighteen millions of persons in our country who, in 1889, were of from seven to eighteen years of age. It will surprise not a few of the friends and supporters of Catholic schools, not to speak of their enemies, when we say that our Catholic schools make a much better showing. Yet statistics fully confirm this statement, as we hope to be able clearly to show before we have finished.

We now take up the question of the number of *Catholic* children in our country who are of what is the *practical* school age in the United States, according to the statistics we have cited. We have seen, from the statistics of the United States Commissioner of Education, that the vast majority (ninety-six per cent.) of the pupils in all the public schools in the United States are between the ages of seven and fourteen years. The number of children included in that period is exactly, or almost exactly, one-sixth of the whole population of our country.

Apply these figures to Catholic parochial schools. There are upwards of seven hundred thousand children in these schools, and almost all of them are between the ages of seven and fourteen. The Catholic population of our country (that is, the number of practical Catholics) is variously estimated at from nine millions to ten millions. One-sixth of nine millions is one and one-half millions. One-sixth of ten millions is one and two-thirds millions. We care not which estimate is adopted. According to the first there are 1,500,000 Catholic children of practical school age in the United States; according to the second there are 1,667,000.

But there is another fact that must be borne in mind. It is that the period mentioned, from seven years of age to fourteen, is longer, by at least two years, than the average number of years that pupils attend either the public schools or Catholic parochial schools. The average period both in the public schools and in Catholic parochial schools does not exceed five years. It is not necessary to occupy space in proving this. The State and National educational reports testify to the truth of what we have said as regards the public schools, and statistics of the parochial schools prove it as regards these last-mentioned schools.

This fact, if duly considered, shows that a further reduction of at least one-fifth must be made from the figures given to show the real number of Catholic children that do attend or that can reasonably be expected to attend school, whether parochial or public. We deduct one-fifth, and the 1,500,000 children, according to one estimate, and the 1,667,000, according to the other estimate, are reduced, respectively, to 1,200,000 in the one case and to 1,334,000 in the other.

Now for the assertion that the parochial school system has failed in the purpose for which it was instituted. What have Catholics in our country actually done in the way of providing for the education of their children in Catholic parochial schools? According to the last Catholic Directory the number of children in Catholic parochial schools in the year 1891, so far as could be ascertained, was 700,753. To this must be added, at the very least, 50,000 children attending Catholic parochial schools from which no reports were received. There are upwards of 25,000 children in Catholic orphan asylums to which schools are attached (the exact number reported is 24,572, and fourteen dioceses are not reported). Moreover, there are other Catholic eleemosynary institutions in which Catholic children are educated. Taking these facts into consideration, we feel fully justified in saying that the number of Catholic children in parochial or other like schools of from seven to fourteen years of age is at least 800,000, and probably 850,000. We have, then, eight hundred thousand Catholic children of the ages mentioned, who are educated in Catholic schools, over against a total of 1,200,000, or of 1,334,000 Catholic children (whichever estimate you adopt), or, according to the first estimate, sixty-six and two-thirds per cent.; according to the second estimate, sixty per cent.

The inference is, and it is borne out by the statistics we have given, that the Catholics of our country, notwithstanding the double burden they must bear, are doing more to give *their* children a Catholic education, than are the people of the United States, as a whole, to educate children in the public schools, though the latter are supported by public taxation; and, in a number of States and cities, are backed by compulsory education laws. Surely there is nothing in these facts to discourage Catholics or to justify the *pessimistic* assertion that the Catholic parochial school system is a practical failure.

There is another very important and very encouraging fact which an examination of Catholic statistics clearly shows. It is that the proportionate increase in the number of Catholic children of the ages mentioned, in attendance upon Catholic parochial schools, is more than double that of the increase of Catholic population in the same period.

Here are the figures: In 1882 the number of children attending Catholic parochial schools was 428,642; in 1891 the number was 700,753, an increase during nine years of sixty-four per cent. The number of Catholics in 1882, as given in the Catholic Directory was 6,832,954; the number in 1891 was 8,647,221, an increase of twenty-six and one-half per cent. Now apply these proportions to Catholic schools on the one hand and to Catholic population on the other, and see what the result will be, nine years hence.

Taking 1,200,000 as the number of Catholic children of the ages mentioned and adding twenty-six and a-half per cent, we will have 1,518,000, and taking 800,000 as the number of children in Catholic parochial schools, orphan asylums, etc., and adding sixty-four per cent., we will have, nine years hence, 1,312,000 children receiving a Catholic education, or nearly all the Catholic children, of practical school age, in the United States. If you take the other estimate—that the number of Catholic children of practical school age in the United States is 1,334,000—as your basis of computation, you will arrive at substantially the same conclusion.

Nine years, or twice nine years, is a very short period in the history of the Church and of our country. To realize the blessed results above shown to be not only possible, but certainly attainable, it only requires that the Catholics of the United States, Bishops, Priests, and laity continue their present exertions, their present self-sacrifices, their present zeal for Catholic education. Far from being discouraged, we Catholics have every reason for being encouraged. There is every reason not only for not relaxing effort and zeal for Catholic education, but for renewing and redoubling them. Most fruitful of blessed results, have been, and are, the Catholic parochial schools of the United States. Love for the Church, love for the welfare of our country, demand that they be generously supported, increased in number, and in efficiency.

And now we dismiss the question of the ability of the Catholic parochial school system to sufficiently provide for the education of all the Catholic children in our country, who may reasonably be expected to attend them. We propose, in conclusion, to say a few words to our pessimist friends, who have persuaded themselves, and tried to persuade the public, that after forty years of earnest efforts the Catholics of the United States have been barely able to establish parochial schools sufficient to educate less than one-third of the Catholic children of practical school age in the United States. The assertion is utterly false. In the first place the period in which the Catholics of the United States have been so circumstanced that they could devote much of their attention, efforts, and money to the parochial school system is not forty years. It is less than twenty years. The fact is so well known that we need not stop to explain. In the second place, the progress made in this blessed work during the last ten years has been at least two-fold greater than in any other previous period. We hazard nothing in predicting that the progress in the next ten years will be much greater than during the last ten years. So far as we can see, so far as we believe, there is no abatement of effort or of zeal on the part, generally, of our Bishops, Priests or laity. On

the contrary there is a manifest increase. It calls for no prophet to predict that in the next nine or ten years practically all the Catholic children in our country will be in attendance on Catholic schools.

With one other remark we conclude. Conceding for the sake of argument, what we refuse to concede as a matter of fact—for it is not a fact, that the Catholic parochial schools are now, and ever will be, incapable of educating more than 700,000 or 800,000 children of Catholics in the United States,—that would be no reason for withdrawing support from the Catholic parochial schools. Every rector of a Catholic Church, who has a parochial school in his parish knows, and every curate in such a parish knows, that the children who are educated in the parochial schools, are far better prepared for first communion, and for confirmation, than he or they can prepare, with utmost pains and effort, the Catholic children who attend public schools. Every such rector and every such curate knows full well that the children educated in the parochial schools are the *hope* of the parish; that it is *they* and not the children educated in public schools, who will be the most exemplary practical, devout members of the Church; that it is from *them* and not from the Catholic children educated in the public schools, that the sodalities and confraternities of the parish are chiefly recruited and receive their most exemplary members. We might enlarge but we forbear. The work of Catholic parochial school education is a thrice blessed work. It has been blessed by Sovereign Pontiffs of the Church, blessed by the Fathers of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, blessed by its evident results.

GEORGE D. WOLFF.

Scientific Chronicle.

LIGHT-HOUSE CONSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

WE had begun to think that the readers of this REVIEW would be getting about tired of "Light-Houses," and were on the point of striking out for pastures new, when it was pointed out to us that we had left a good part of the subject untouched, and we were requested to make good the deficiency. We were indeed already well aware that the matter was by no means exhausted; it would require volumes for that. Now, gentle reader, possess your soul in peace. We are not going to write volumes, but only this one short article, promising that, sink or swim, survive or perish, it shall be the last on this topic. In this article all we propose is to say a few words about the construction of some typical American Light-Houses.

THE OLD MINOT'S LEDGE LIGHT-HOUSE.

The terrible storm which visited our coasts in the the Spring of 1851 is not yet forgotten by those who witnessed it; but among the calamities of that dread April, none have left a more lasting impression on the minds of men than the destruction of Minot's Ledge Light-House. It was of the iron-skeleton type, planned and erected by Captain W. H. Swift, of the U. S. Engineer Corps. A few selections from his official report, dated November, 1848, will give a good idea of the work:

"Minot's Rocks—or as they are generally called 'The Minots,'—lie off the southeastern chop of Boston Bay. These rocks or ledges, with others in their immediate vicinity, are also known as the 'Cohasset Rocks,' and have been the terror of mariners for a long period of years; they have been, probably, the cause of a greater number of wrecks than any other ledges or reefs on the coast, lying as they do at the very entrance to the second city of the United States in point of tonnage, and consequently where vessels are constantly passing and repassing. The Minots are bare only at three-quarters ebb, and vessels bound in, with the wind heavy at the northeast, are liable, if they fall to the leeward of Boston light, to be driven upon these reefs. The rock selected for the site of the light-house is called the 'Outer Minot,' and is the most seaward of the group." The nearest shore is Cohasset, one and a half miles south, while Boston Light (Little Brewster) is about eight miles to the northwest, and from the latter, the town of Boston itself lies eight miles due west. At extreme low water an area of about 30 feet in diameter is exposed, and the highest point in the rock is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the line of low water. It is very rarely, however, that a surface greater than 25 feet in diameter is left bare by the sea.

"The rock is granite, with vertical seams of trap rising through it.

The form of the light-house is an octagon, 25 feet in diameter at the base. The structure is supported on nine heavy wrought-iron piles, one at each corner of the octagon, and one at the centre; holes 12 inches in diameter, and 5 feet deep were drilled in the rock to receive these piles; the outer holes at such an inclination that, at an elevation of 60 feet above the base of the middle pile, the pile-heads would be brought within the periphery of a circle 14 feet in diameter. The centre pile was 8 inches in diameter at the bottom, and 6 inches at top; the other piles have the same diameter, 8 inches at the bottom, and $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches at the top; at their upper ends they are securely keyed and bolted to the arms of a heavy casting or cap. It is understood that the foundation piles do not extend the whole 60 feet; but that there are in all three series of piles joined to each other by very stout cast-iron sockets and strongly braced."

These series, or sections, were of nearly equal height, and at their junctions, sets of strong horizontal braces were securely fastened to the piles, thus constituting two skeleton floors, one at a height of 20, the other at a height of about 40 feet above the foundation. Later on, vertical tie-rods were introduced between these floors, in order to assist in rendering the structure proof against undue vibrations. On top of this foundation was placed the lantern, bringing the height of the whole up to 70 feet. Moreover, immediately under the lantern, a store-room about 12 feet deep was constructed, access to which could be had through the floor or the lantern.

In the construction of this light-house, the principal difficulty encountered was the drilling of those nine holes, 5 feet deep and 1 foot in diameter, in the solid granite. We hardly understand now why a 12-inch hole was considered necessary to receive an 8-inch pier, unless perchance it was for the sake of greater ease in planting such heavy masses of iron in place, or perhaps to leave room for wedges to hold the piers to the rock; no cement seems to have been used in the work. The first blow was struck on the rock in the Spring of 1847 and the whole work completed, and the light exhibited in November, 1848. The cost was something less than \$40,000. Two keepers were installed, and all went on pleasantly till April, 1851. The report of Captain Swift reads as follows:

"On Monday night, April 14th, the wind which had been easterly for several days, gradually increased. On Tuesday it had become a severe gale from the northeast. It continued to blow with the utmost violence through Tuesday night, Wednesday, Thursday, and even Friday; but the height of the storm was on Wednesday, the 16th, and at that time it was a perfect hurricane. The light on the Minot was last seen from Cohasset, on Wednesday night at 10 o'clock; at 1 o'clock, Thursday morning the 17th, the light-house bell was heard on shore, one-and-one-half miles distant; and this being the hour of high water, or rather the turn of the tide, when from the opposition of the wind and the tide it is supposed that the sea was at its very highest mark; and it was at that hour, it is generally believed, that the light-house was

destroyed; at day-break nothing of it was visible from the shore, and hence it is most probable it was overthrown at or about the hour named."

When the storm had sufficiently abated, the site was visited (April 22d), and a part of the wrecked structure was found more than 100 feet away. The piers held firm to their moorings in the rock, but were broken or twisted off, leaving stumps from four to six feet in length. The bodies of the unfortunate keepers were never recovered.

Various causes have been assigned by different writers for the unexpected destruction of Minot's Ledge Light-House. We will sum them up in as few words as possible.

In the first place the keeper did a foolish thing. To the second set of horizontal braces he fastened a sort of deck or platform on which he stowed such heavy articles as fuel, barrels of water, etc. These should have been in the store-room above. It is evident that, if the waves should reach this platform, the large surface it offered to their shock would be a source of great danger. On Wednesday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, that platform came ashore at Cohasset. How much the light-house was strained and weakened by the blows of the waves against the 175 square feet of platform, before it parted, no one can conjecture. Nor was this the only piece of folly on the part of the keeper. He had also attached a five-and-a-half inch hawser to the lantern deck, and anchored the other end to a granite block weighing seven tons, placed at a distance of some 300 feet from the base of the tower. Its purpose was to provide a means of running a landing chair or box up and down. This was very handy no doubt, and the keeper was a handy man, but he belonged to that class of men who know just enough not to know how much they don't know. To be of any use, that long cable had to be made fairly taut, and when the waves swept by, it must have exerted a tremendous pull on the end of that 60-foot lever. If, besides, what is quite possible, the separate pulls happened to be timed to the vibration-period of the tower, then, sooner or later, something would have to give. The effect was, as Captain Swift observes, just as if a number of men were pulling at a rope attached to the highest part of the structure, with the *design* of pulling it down.

Again, the storm itself was something unparalleled in the history of our Atlantic coast. A heavy wind blowing continuously, and with ever increasing violence for several days, from the east, would necessarily pile the waters up far above their usual level, and at the same time very greatly increase the violence of the waves. That such really did take place is evidenced by the fact that the platform, mentioned above, was, as we have seen, torn from its fastenings, although its position on the tower was 36 feet above ordinary high water, and 28 feet above the highest spring tides. A few feet more would bring the waves in contact with the main body of the structure; and if this really did take place, it is clear that such a sea acting upon the surface of the building, at the end of a lever-arm more than 60 feet long, would be well nigh irresistible. We know too that the lower portions of cities along the

coast were flooded, and we recollect specially seeing boats paddled around in the streets of Salem, Mass., for a couple of days. A further evidence of the exceptional violence of that storm was that vessels were wrecked in the very harbor of Boston, among others, the "Royal George," of Liverpool. Such, under the circumstances, seem to be the principal causes of the fall of Minot's Ledge Light-House.

When this much has been said, one thing remains certain, viz., that the real defect of Minot's Ledge Light-House was its want of magnitude. If Congress had appropriated \$150,000 instead of \$40,000, an iron skeleton could have been built having a base of 40 feet and a height of 100 feet, and it is safe to say that the waves would never have reached the enclosed portion of the structure, and that it would have laughed at the storm of 1851, and be standing to-day as solid and sound as ever. Nothing defeats its own ends so surely, in the long run, as littleness and narrowness when there is question of a great undertaking.

THE NEW MINOT'S LEDGE LIGHT-HOUSE.

The necessity of a light at this point, in the interest both of commerce and of humanity, was so evident that Congress immediately voted an appropriation for the purpose. But before anything could be done, the Light-House Board, as now constituted, was created in August, 1852, and to it the whole subject was turned over. General G. J. Totten, Chief of Engineers, a member of the Board, drew up the plans for a stone tower, and entrusted the execution to Captain (afterwards General) Barton S. Alexander, an eminent member of the Engineer Corps. Under his direction, Major Ogden, by taking advantage of low tides, made a careful survey of the rock, from which survey it was learned that it would not be possible to construct a tower of more than 22 feet in diameter without going outside of the low-water limit; but by going outside of this limit somewhat in five places, a diameter of 30 feet could be obtained. Surveys, consultations, and other preliminaries occupied so much time that work was not begun till the summer of 1855. Alexander thus describes the difficulties of the undertaking:

"It was a more difficult work of construction than either the Eddystone, the Bell Rock, or the Skerryvore, for the Eddystone was founded all above low-water, part of its foundation being up to high-water level. The foundation of Bell Rock was about 3 feet above low-water, while the Skerryvore had its foundation above high-water level; whereas a good part of the Minot's foundation was below low-water. There had to be a combination of favorable circumstances to enable us to *land* on the Minot rock at the beginning of that work; *a perfectly smooth sea, a dead calm, and low spring tides*. This could only happen about six times during any one lunation; three at full moon and three at the change. Frequently one or the other of the necessary conditions would fail, and there were at times months, even in summer, when we could not land there at all. Our working season was from April 1st to September 15th. Work was prosecuted with all possible diligence for more than three years before a single stone could be laid. The difficulty was

to cut the foundation rock into the proper shape and then lay these stones."

Alexander himself first visited the rock on May 1, 1855, and made a re-measurement at dead low-water with the hope of getting a few inches more than the 30 feet for the foundation; but nature did not want any fractions there, and not an inch more could he get. The skeleton of 1851 was still there, grinning at him from under the water, and he must have needed a stout heart to enable him to go on; the heart was there and the head likewise.

A little skirmishing was done, during the month of June, in the way of clearing the rock of sea-weeds and muscles, and in loosening up the old iron stumps. At daylight, on Sunday morning, July 1st, a small party of men landed on the rock and began the work of marking the points of the various levels which were to be cut away, and of getting things ready generally for the next summer's campaign. During the season of 1856 an iron scaffold was erected. It consisted, says Major Heap, of nine wrought-iron shafts inserted into the holes of the old iron light-house, and rising to a height of 20 feet above low-water, the whole bound together at the top by a strong wrought-iron frame; these shafts were 10 inches in diameter at the bottom and 7 inches at the top. It gave great confidence to new hands. By stretching lines between the posts across the rock in various directions, and about 2 or 3 feet above it, every workman had something within easy reach to lay hold of when a wave broke over the rock. Verily, they must have had jolly times at that job.

The work of cutting away the rock and preparing it to receive the masonry was not completed till the summer of 1858; but in the meantime a great deal of work had been done on the neighboring shore. Store-rooms, work-shops, and a stone-yard had been provided, and whenever the weather would not permit landing or working on the Minot, the men were employed in cutting the stone for the tower.

Not to let the sad traditions of Minot's Ledge die out too soon, the bark *New Empire*, loaded with cotton, ran on to the rock in January, 1857, and swept away the iron scaffold, breaking off the iron posts very much as those of the light-house had been broken in the great storm. The scaffold was not replaced, as by this time it was found unnecessary.

A permanent coffer-dam could not be constructed, on account of the violence of the waves under the influence of the prevailing easterly winds, but a species of temporary coffer-dam was very ingeniously contrived. Bags of heavy cotton-duck, which were practically watertight, were partially filled with sand; at low-water two or three hundred of these were built up as a wall against the sea at a place where it was intended to lay a stone in mortar. The water in the miniature bay thus formed was bailed out, and the place kept dry by means of large sponges till the stone was properly laid in its bed of cement. In some cases, however, the stone had to be laid in the water itself; to accomplish this feat, a large piece of thin muslin was laid on a flat surface,

and a layer of cement spread over it; the stone was laid on this bed of cement, the muslin folded up neatly around the stone, and, when the cement had just begun to set (in ten or fifteen minutes), the stone was lowered away to its place. Previous experiments had proved that the cement would ooze through the muslin and make a good bond with the rock below.

When, at last, the foundation was built up above low-water level, the work proceeded more rapidly. An iron mast was set up in the central hole of the former light-house, and rigged up as a derrick, though for some time the machinery and rigging had to be put on and taken off every day that landings were made for laying masonry. The derrick was of simple construction, and was so arranged as to float in the water, so that all that had to be done in "stripping the derrick," after a tide's work was over, was to cast the machinery loose from the mast and throw it, with the attached rigging, overboard; it was then picked by the boats and towed to the tender.

At the end of the season of 1858, about twelve feet of the tower had been completed, after which ordinary tides and winds interfered but little with the progress of the work. On June 29, 1860, just five years after the commencement, the last stone was laid. The building of the lantern, erection of machinery, etc., occupied the remainder of that season, and the light was exhibited for the first time at sunset, November 15, 1860. Despite the many difficulties and dangers of the undertaking, not a life was lost, nor was any one seriously injured during the building of the light-house. This was due to the careful regulations established and enforced for the safety of the workmen, especially during the cutting down of the ledge and the laying of the foundation. Thus :

1. No person was employed who could not swim, or who could not pull an oar and manage a small boat.

2. No landing should be attempted from one boat; two boats, at least, must be always together.

3. While workmen were on the ledge, a small boat, with at least three men in it, should be stationed immediately alongside the rock, on its lee-side, to pick up the men who were occasionally washed from the rock.

The structure is solid, around a narrow central well, up to the sill of the entrance door, a height of 40 feet; at this point the diameter is $23\frac{1}{2}$ feet. From this to the spring of the cornice, where the external diameter is about 18 feet, the walls gradually decrease in thickness from 4 feet 9 inches to about 2 feet. The hollow cylindrical space thus left is 14 feet in diameter; it is 40 feet high, and is divided into five stories of one room each. Above the cornice is another room, 10 feet in diameter and 7 feet 9 inches high. These six rooms serve as store-rooms, and as apartments for the keepers. The lantern which crowns the whole is 10 feet in height, with a dome of 5 feet, an ornamental finish of 4 feet, and a pinnacle of 7 feet 4 inches, making in all a height of 114 feet 1 inch from the bottom of the lowest stone. The structure is purely conical. Longfellow says that "it rises out of the sea like a

beautiful stone cannon, mouth upward, belching forth only friendly fires." The centre of the lamp-flame is 96 feet above low-water, and consequently, to a person whose eye is 15 feet above the water, it would be visible at a distance of full $15\frac{1}{2}$ nautical miles.

The weight of the tower is 5881 tons; this alone is enough to insure stability; but since the original 12-inch holes were still there, there was no use in wasting them, and so eight iron posts, 10 inches in diameter and 25 feet long, were firmly cemented both into the rock and the masonry of the tower.

The total cost, including a small supplementary building on shore, was \$200,000. This was the first important work undertaken by the present Light-House Board, and it has had no reason to be ashamed of the result; only, if Congress had been a little more generous (say two or three times more generous), at the outset, way back in the "forties," the present light-house would never have been needed. Still, it is well; for when men have failed to be wise beforehand, it is yet well to know how to be wise behindhand.

We have lingered thus long on the subject of Minot's Ledge Light-House, first, because of its historical associations, taking us back as it does, through nearly half a century, to the days of our childhood and innocence, and restoring with fresh tints many a half-forgotten memory of the dear, old, buried past. Secondly, because both in its old form and in its new it offers us a type of the best form of sea-rock light-houses, and brings clearly to view the immense difficulties of their construction, showing, at the same time, how men of energy and daring succeed in overcoming those difficulties. There are only about a dozen of such light-houses in existence, and but one other in the United States, but if not the most numerous they are certainly the most noteworthy, and stand as examples of perhaps the most remarkable feats of marine engineering that the world has ever seen. What Walter Scott wrote in the Visitors' Album of the Bell Rock Light-House, is appropriate to them all.

"Far in the bosom of the deep,
O'er these wild shelves my watch I keep,
A ruddy gem of changeful light,
Bound on the dusky brow of Night;
The seaman bids my lustre 'hail!'
And scorns to strike his timorous sail."

It ends pretty flat, but we must not forget that they are *Album* verses.

SCREW PILE LIGHT-HOUSES.

Another type of light-house owes its peculiarity to its screw-pile foundation, the invention of which is due to Alexander Mitchell, of England. The lower end of an iron pile, say from six to twelve inches in diameter, is forged to a point; near this end is attached a disk-like screw of a diameter of three feet or more, with a pitch (distance between the threads) of six inches. The groove between the threads is

fully a foot deep all around, and the threads, which are only two or three in number, are quite thin, especially at their edges. This screw is forced down by turning the pile, and when the depth judged necessary, according to the character of the bottom, is reached, it is left in place, and the threads of the screw serve as a foot to support the weight above. The size and number of such screw-piles used in a given construction will vary with the intended size and weight of the superstructure. This is usually a dwelling and store-house of wood, surmounted by a metal lantern. The piles are set in the form of a square, or of a hexagon, or of an octagon, and are, of course, thoroughly braced in all directions.

These screw-pile structures are adapted to sandy bottoms under water, in places where the bottom is not liable to be washed out by currents, and where, at the same time, there is little or no danger to be feared from large masses of floating ice.

As far as we are aware, the most northerly one is at Bridgeport, Conn.; another, nearly in the same latitude, stands on Long Beach Bar, Long Island; the next, on Brandywine Shoal, Del. South of that they dot the coast pretty thickly all the way to Texas. The height of these lights above water varies from 27 feet to 56 feet; they are visible therefore to an eye 15 feet above the water, at a distance of from ten to twelve nautical miles.

A queer accident happened to one of these light-houses. In 1884-85, an hexagonal screw-pile structure was built on the east side of the dredged channel, in Mobile Bay, Ala. It was scarcely finished when it began to sink in the soft mud, and went down bodily seven feet and a half, without canting more than two or three inches from the vertical, and without being strained or distorted in the least. Things began to look blue, for the engineers thought they had struck a quicksand. An injunction, however, was put upon this sinking business by driving twelve enormous wooden piles into the mud and bolting the light-house to them. Since then no further subsidence has been observed.

OTHER TYPES.

On Florida's coral strand, there are at least a half dozen magnificent iron skeleton light-houses, the foundation piles for which were *driven into the live coral rock*, a distance of 10 feet or more, through the centre of immense iron disks which rest on the surface of the rock. They are from 110 to 140 feet high, and are equipped as first order lights. Here the screw-pile could not be used, and the coral would not bear the weight of a stone tower of the required height.

Sometimes, in deep water, where neither the screw-pile, nor other skeleton structure could be well or safely located, recourse has been had to "crib" foundations. They are of various kinds in detail, but all consist essentially of a crib of wood or metal, rectangular or circular, sunk to a suitable depth in the sands of a shoal, or resting on the surface of a submerged rock, and protected, if need be, by rip-raps against the scouring action of the water, and filled up with concrete to a proper

height above the sea level. On this, a stone light-house may be built with just as much assurance of safety as if it were founded on the solid rock. A good example of this kind of work is seen in the Fourteen-Foot Bank Light-House, Del. An iron cylinder, 35 feet in diameter, 73 feet long, and made of cast-iron plates $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches thick, was sunk, by means of a caisson, till its upper edge was 24 feet above water, and its foot buried 35 feet in the sand. This was filled nearly to the top with concrete, and on this, a two-story dwelling, and a tower showing a light 59 feet above the sea, were erected. Congress had made an appropriation for this work of \$175,000, but it was completed in all its details, lens, fog-signal and all, for \$123,811.45.

A similar plan has been advocated and tried on the Outer Diamond shoal, off Cape Hatteras, N. C. The water is so rough and so unruly at that place, that neither buoys nor light-ships can live there, and the light on the mainland, about nine miles distant, although a first order light, at an elevation of 191 feet above the sea, is not a sufficient warning against these shoals. A contract was signed about three years ago by Messrs. Anderson and Barr, to plant a light there for the sum of \$485,000. A caisson of steel and iron, weighing 1200 tons, was built, and towed to the spot last spring; but in the attempt to sink it in place, the structure was totally wrecked, and the workmen barely escaped with their lives. The contractors lost nearly \$100,000 in the attempted enterprise. The Light-House Board is again in a brown study over the matter, and it is to be hoped that it will soon evolve some plan that may prove successful.

The last light-houses of which we have to speak are those which are built on dry land, high above all possible contact with the waves. Some are of wood, some of brick or stone; some are iron shells lined with brick; others, in fine, are iron skeletons. The wooden ones are generally modest affairs and need not delay us. Fire Island Light-House, L. I., and Shinnecock Bay Light-House, 35 miles to the east of the former, are examples of imposing structures of brick; the first sheds its light from a height of 168 feet above the water, while the second is only eight feet lower. They are both lights of the first order, and can be seen at a distance of nearly 20 miles.

At Navesink, N. J., there are two brown stone towers, one square, the other octagonal, each 53 feet high, but on account of their position on the highlands, their lights are 248 feet above the sea, so that they are visible for nearly 23 miles.

As a specimen of the "shell-tower," the light-house on Hunting Island, S. C., may be mentioned. Iron panels were cast, each weighing about 1200 pounds, and of the proper shape to form, when assembled, a frustum of a cone. They were about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches thick, and were provided with internal flanges, so that the whole operation of putting them up consisted in swinging the different pieces into position, and securing them with bolts. The lower section was also bolted all around to a heavy concrete foundation. The height from the foundation to the light itself is 121 feet, 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ inches; from the sea-level it is 133 feet.

The diameter at the base is 25 feet, at the top 13 feet. The tower is divided into ten stories, the floors of which serve as very efficient bracing, and is plentifully provided with windows throughout its entire height. It was erected in 1875 on a site fully a quarter of a mile from the beach, but on account of the erosion of the land by the sea, it had to be taken down in 1889, and was then moved a mile and a quarter further back. The original cost was \$102,000; the cost of removal just half that amount.

Finally, we have iron skeleton towers of various shapes and often of great heights. Thus, the rear light of the Paris Island Range, S. C., is a triangular pyramid, the base of which measures over forty feet on each side. By means of a windlass and crank the light, which is similar to a locomotive head-light, is run up on guiding-rails on the outside of the structure to a height of 123 feet, but the full height to the apex of the pyramid is 132 feet. The cost, including iron-work, machinery, oil-house, lamp, reflector and everything, was only about \$12,000. South-West-Pass, at the mouth of the Mississippi, is provided with a similar light-house.

Lastly, we come to Hell Gate. To illuminate the narrow, intricate and dangerous channel called Hell Gate, Long Island Sound, N. Y., an iron skeleton frustum of a pyramid was erected by the Light-House Board in 1883-84. Its height, to be very exact, was 255 feet and $\frac{1}{2}$ of an inch. It was square, and measured 54 feet each way at the base and 6 feet at the top. It carried nine electric lights of 6000 candle power each, and cost about \$11,000, everything included. At night the effect was grand. The tower itself could not be seen, and the light appeared as if suspended from the heavens without any visible means of support. It accomplished all that was intended, and more, for the light was so brilliant that it dazzled the eyes of the pilots, and the shadows thrown were so heavy that they took the appearance of obstacles. The light was therefore discontinued, and the tower sold for old iron in 1886.

"Liberty Enlightening the World" on Bedloe's Island, New York Harbor, holds up a torch of nine electric lights at a height of 305 feet above sea level, which is visible $24\frac{1}{2}$ miles at sea, or more than 10 miles beyond the outside light-ships. Besides the lights of the torch, there are 5 other arc lights near the base, arranged in such a way as to illuminate the statue itself without being visible at sea, and this number is to be shortly increased.

RANGE OF VISIBILITY AT SEA.

If the surface of the sea were flat, as was imagined by the wiseacres of ancient times, a light of sufficient power, placed anywhere above the water, would be visible to an indefinite distance. Even at the very dawn of history men must have noticed that objects retreating on the water appeared to *sink* out of sight and to *rise* again on approaching the observer. It is passing strange, that for hundreds, nay, thousands of years, they failed to see that this phenomenon proved that the surface of the sea was not flat but convex. Anyhow, we know it now; and we

know, too, that the distance at which an object can be seen over the surface of the sea depends on its elevation and on that of the observer's eye above that surface. In the following table, heights are given, feet, and distances of visibility in nautical miles, the nautical mile being about $\frac{1}{8}$ longer than the statute or common mile :

HEIGHT.	DISTANCE.	HEIGHT.	DISTANCE.
Feet.	Nautical Miles.	Feet.	Nautical Miles.
5	2.555	110	11.986
10	3.614	120	12.519
15	4.426	130	13.030
20	5.111	140	13.522
25	5.714	150	13.997
30	6.260	200	16.162
35	6.761	250	18.070
40	7.228	300	19.795
45	7.666	350	21.381
50	8.081	400	22.857
55	8.476	450	24.244
60	8.852	500	25.555
65	9.214	550	26.802
70	9.562	600	27.994
75	9.897	650	29.137
80	10.222	700	30.237
85	10.536	750	31.298
90	10.842	800	32.325
95	11.139	900	34.286
100	11.428	1000	36.140

EXAMPLE.—Height of Cape Fear Light (N. C.), 100 ft. ; visible	Miles.
Add for height of look-out's eye, say 50 ft.,	11.428
	8.081
Therefore, distance from ship to light,	19.509

But since light-houses have a trick of giving us all sorts of odd heights not found in the table, the hearts of our mathematical friends will take comfort and rejoice in the formula : $D = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{H}$. That is, take the height (H) of the object in feet, and extract the square root of that number ; then multiply the root found by $\frac{2}{3}$; the result will be the distance in nautical miles (D).

Example. Height of St. Augustine Light, Fla., 161 feet. The square root of 161 is 12.7 nearly ; 12.7 multiplied by $\frac{2}{3}$ is 14.5 miles,

range for an eye at sea level. The lookout's eye is, say, 60 feet high. From the table, this gives a range of 8.852 miles. Adding 14.5 and 8.852 we get 23.352, say $23\frac{1}{3}$ nautical miles.

It follows from the table, that to a person out on the ocean whose eye is 20 feet above the water, the sky and sea appear to meet at a distance of about 5 miles all around; if he be *four* times as high (80 feet) his horizon will be *twice* as far (10 miles) away; and if he were *nine* times as high, his range would be *three times* as great. The same rule holds good when looking from the land out to sea. A balloon, at a height of three miles, would have a range, in every direction, of about 144 miles; consequently, if stationed over Wilmington, Del., it would, except where mountains might interfere, take in the whole line from New York City to Washington, all the sea coast from Brooklyn to Ocean City, the upper half of the Chesapeake; Frederick City, Harrisburg, Wilkes-Barre, and even the town of Woodstock, Md. On a clear day, with a good telescope, it would be a sight to be remembered for a lifetime.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

Book Notices.

IRELAND AND SAINT PATRICK. By *William Bullen Morris*, of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London and New York; Burns & Oates, Limited; Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1891.

We are glad Father Morris has given us in a separate and permanent form the learned and beautiful essays of which this book is composed. The last two are new; the others have already appeared in the pages of the Dublin "Review," and of the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record." Though written, as the author tells us, at long intervals of time, they are distinguished throughout by a remarkable unity of spirit and design and are either intimately connected with or form a natural sequel to the great subject, the critical study of which Fr. Morris began, as he tells us elsewhere, some thirty years ago, and which he has since prosecuted evidently with undiminished interest. Part of the fruits of that prolonged study the public has already enjoyed in the successive editions of the author's "Life of St. Patrick," and those of our readers who are acquainted with that excellent work will be readily assured that they will find the present volume equally interesting and profitable.

The first chapter treats of the relations between St. Martin and St. Patrick; and among the points on which the author has succeeded in throwing a new light we may particularly mention that in which he traces the itinerary of St. Patrick in returning to his own country on his escape from slavery.

We think it is now beyond reasonable doubt that St. Patrick landed at Bordeaux, and passed through Trajectus (Poitiers), and St. Patrice, on his way to Mormontier. In the matter of the Saint's longevity and personal relations with St. Martin, we do not think Fr. Morris has been equally successful. He follows the common opinion, and shows indeed that intrinsically it is neither impossible nor improbable, and that it has, besides, the support of numerous early and mediæval authorities. For ourselves, however, we believe there are strong reasons for holding that these ancient authorities misunderstood the meaning of some statements in the original documents which they had before them and reckoned as continuous and successive certain periods of time which, in reality, overlapped each other considerably.

The chapter on Adrian IV. and Henry Plantagenet occupies 83 pages; but we are of the opinion that the reader will find it none too long and will experience a large share of the pleasure which, as we are told, the investigation imparted to the author. The authenticity of the supposed bull of Adrian, authorizing Henry's invasion of Ireland, has been often discussed. We can not, of course, enter at any length into the matter here; a few remarks, however, may not be out of place. At first sight the authorities in favor of the authenticity of the documents are so numerous, and the arguments apparently so strong, that we do not wonder so many have been carried away by them, and some even led to suspect that those who question or reject it are influenced merely or chiefly by a fear that a belief in its genuineness would be injurious to the interests of religion. The suspicion is an unworthy one and could hardly be entertained by any who had learned the facts and weighed

the strength of the arguments on the other side. To those who may feel an interest in this matter, we would recommend especially, besides the present essay, Cardinal Moran's article in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record," November, 1872, and a dissertation of over 140 folio columns in the French periodical, "Analecta juris Pontificis," for 1882. Like Fr. Morris, however, we do not accept the latter writer's theory, that in Adrian's letter to Louis VII., of France, refusing to countenance a proposed joint expedition of Louis and Henry, the country referred to as the object of the expedition was really Ireland, not Spain; the initial of the manuscript having, as the contents, been wrongly understood by the first editors to stand for Hispania instead of Hibernia. But while we believe the French writer to be mistaken on this point, we are sure that no one who compares the two documents, the undoubtedly genuine letter to Louis and the supposed one to Henry, can doubt that one is based on and largely plagiarized from the other.

The two letters begin exactly alike, the first sentence in the one to Henry containing thirty-one words absolutely identical with those in the opening of that to Louis, while the rest are nearly all synonymous. Now, at a time when letters and documents were carefully distinguished and quoted by their opening words, such a thing, we believe, the writer is correct in holding to be without a parallel in the case of genuine documents. Certainly, one may turn over the nearly eighteen hundred letters of Adrian and his successor without finding anything like it. We may remark that Henry must have received a copy of the letter sent to Louis, both having joined in sending the same ambassador, who was, in fact, Henry's immediate subject, Rotrod, the Norman Bishop of Evreux.

As to the numerous writers who have quoted the bull or given it at length in their works it may be truly said that they are not independent authorities; they have merely copied one another and may all be traced back to Giraldus Cambrensis. Dr. Lanigan, and after him Mr. O'Callaghan, Dr. Kelly, and Drs. Pabisch and Byrne in their notes to their translation of Alzog have laid great weight on the fact that it was known to Pope John XXII. and that a codex containing it was found by Bannius in the Vatican library; but this codex Vaticanus Fr. Theiner discovered to be merely a manuscript copy of Matthew Paris. Now Matthew Paris merely continued the chronicle of Roger de Wendover (of which he afterwards made an abridgment) and Roger of Wendover, or rather his predecessor, John de Cella, got his information and took the document in question from Ralph de Siceto, who was probably indebted to Giraldus Cambrensis; though whether true or false, when once published, the document would no doubt be accessible to any English chronicler who wanted to use it. It seems to us, however, a very noteworthy fact that Roger Hooden, one of Henry's chaplains, and the author of *Gesta Regis Henrici II.* whom he follows, perhaps the Treasurer, Fitz-Neal, and Henry's particular friend, Robert de Monte, though they record Henry's transactions minutely year by year, have not a word about the alleged bull. As to John XXII., he may have got his copy from the manuscript afterwards used by Bassarius, or from his chaplain Philip de Slone, afterwards Bishop of Cork, who dedicated to him an abridgment of some of the works of Cambrensis, or perhaps Donald O'Neill and the Irish princes sent him a copy along with their letter of remonstrance.

Most of those who think the letter a forgery attribute it to Giraldus Cambrensis. Fr. Morris gives some reasons for assigning it to Henry himself. We think it more likely to have been got up by somebody else under Henry's direction and it is at least a curious fact, not hitherto

noticed by any one, so far as we know, that it is to be found actually printed among the letters of Henry's Secretary, Peter of Blois. See Giles' edition, vol. ii., p. 201.

The strongest argument in favor of the authenticity of this celebrated letter is undoubtedly the testimony of John of Salisbury. But it is to be remembered that this testimony is only to be found in the last chapter of one of his works, the "*Metaligicus*," and has no proper connection with the work itself, and that this work had scarcely any circulation; for while there are many manuscript copies of his other works, this appears to be preserved only in a single manuscript, from which the printed editions have been derived.

We may add that even if the letter were really genuine, we do not think it would be such a great matter after all. Suppose the United States had a design of invading Mexico, and our President thought it well to acquaint the Pope of the design, alleging that he was going there for the purpose of putting down violence and disturbance and introducing law and order, assuring him at the same time that the rights of the Church would be carefully protected and the interests of the Catholic religion promoted, and that the Pope should write a letter in reply, praising the President for the good intentions he professed, stating that the Holy See had a special interest in Mexico, as being a Catholic country, and urging that in case it should be determined to carry out the designs contemplated, the promises in regard to religion should be faithfully kept; and, if moreover, the existence of such a letter was not made known to the Mexicans until years after the invasion had taken place, and then only by the invaders themselves, when the alleged writer had been sixteen years in his grave, though both he and his successors had all the time a legate actually residing in the country, what sensible Mexican, even if he chose to believe such a letter genuine would think it of much real importance? Now if there is any real difference between this imaginary letter in regard to Mexico and the alleged letter of Adrian, we confess we have not yet been able to discover it.

We should have liked to say something on the other parts of the book; but we have already exceeded our limits and trust that we have said enough to induce those interested in the subject to read the work themselves.

AQUINAS ETHICUS, OR THE MORAL TEACHING OF ST. THOMAS. A Translation of the Principal Portions of the Second Part of the "*Summa Theologica*," with Notes by *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 2 vols. Burns & Oates, London.

Fr. Rickaby has greatly added to his already abundant laurels by his latest production, "*Aquinas Ethicus*." Thoroughly equipped as he is not only by the many years of student and professional life which have given him so full a knowledge and so deep a love of his latest subject, but also by a great power of concise and trenchant English, it would not be easy, if indeed possible, to find in the English-speaking world any other man who could make a better translation of scholastic Latin into easy yet technically correct English. The magnitude of the difficulty of translation alone of such a work as the "*Summa*" can to some extent be estimated when we consider that St. Thomas not only gave the Latin a new power, but in great measure made it a new language by incorporating into it the language and terms of Plato, of Aristotle, of the Academy and of St. Augustine. Whole systems are contained in his use of the words, *participatio*, *rationes*, *exemplaria*, *ideae*, *forma substantialis*, *materia signata*, etc. Yet this book, heretofore closed except to a

few, has been made common to the world by Fr. Rickaby; this hidden tongue has been put into beautiful classic English with scarcely a word to which the most fastidious can take exception, and without much, if any, of that circumlocution and paraphrase so often necessary in translating authors whose style is so brief and neat, whose words and sentences are so clean-cut as are those of the Angelical Doctor in all his work, but particularly in his masterpiece, the famous *secunda secunda*. Take this as a sample chosen at random, of how thoroughly well Fr. Rickaby has done the work he set himself. It is the first article of the thirty-second question and is entitled, "Is alms-giving an act of charity?" In the original it reads: "*Respondeo dicendum quod exteriores actus ad illam virtutem referuntur ad quam pertinet id quod est motivum ad agendum huiusmodi actus; motivum autem ad dandum eleemosynas est ut subveniatur necessitati patienti, unde quidam definiunt eleemosynam alicui quod eleemosyna est opus quo datur aliquid indigenti, ex compassione, propter Deum. Quod quidem motivum pertinet ad misericordiam ut supra dictum est (q. 30 a 1. ad 2.) Unde manifestum est quod aure eleemosynam est proprie actus misericordia. Et hoc apparet ex ipso nomine nam in graeco eleemosyna a misericordia derivatur sicut in latino miseratio, et quia misericordia est effectus caritatis, ut supra ostensum est (q. 30) ex consequenti dare eleemosynam est actus caritatis mediante misericordia.*"

This is the translation: "Exterior acts are referred to that virtue to which their motive belongs; now the motive of alms-giving is to succor one in need. Hence some define almsgiving 'a work whereby something is given to one in need, out of compassion, for the sake of God,' which motive belongs to mercy. And this appears from the name; for in Greek, *eleemosyna* is derived from mercy, and because mercy is an effect of charity it follows that alms-giving is an act of charity, through the medium of mercy."

How neat and true a rendering this is! Could anything be clearer and more concise than the first sentence? It is almost better even than St. Thomas's words. Yet there are better specimens on almost every page, viz., on p. 387, vol. i., where "*huiusmodi necessarii terminus non est in indivisibili constitutus*" is happily rendered "the limit of this necessity is not a hard and fast line;" but the selection given answers the double purpose of being a fair sample of the good work of the translator and also of showing what is perhaps the only defect of this really very able and much needed work. For the question 30, to which St. Thomas refers in explanation and proof of what he says in the quoted article is among the (about) 70 questions and 310 isolated articles which have been omitted, because, as the translator says in his preface, some of them "deal with theology rather than with ethics, some on account of their difficulty, and some for brevity's sake." This article 30 was evidently omitted for the latter reason; yet its omission makes the solution much less clear than the author would have it, and makes St. Thomas appear to do what he never does, dogmatize.

In fact, throughout the "Summa" there is such a close connection between all its parts, so complete a dependence of the succeeding questions and articles on the preceding, so perfect a logical sequence, that to omit anything seems to break that splendid chain of reasoning by which we are led through the "First Part," with its discussion of God in Himself and as Creator, to His creatures, and particularly to man, his faculties and qualities, to the splendid and perfect "Second Part," wherein is discussed the nature of man's happiness, the relations to it of his mind and will, and habits and actions and virtues, theological

and cardinal ; his relations also to the eternal, the natural and human as well as the "Old" and "New" law, and thence to the "Third Part," never finished by the Saint, in which with and by Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life," we are led back through a perfect circle to the God who made us for Himself. And that the omissions thus mar the work by breaking this chain, the article cited is a proof. Because from the text before us it must be divined that mercy is an effect of charity, whereas St. Thomas proved it.

It also seems to us an error of judgment to omit the objections given by St. Thomas at the opening of each article to clear the way and prepare the mind for the correct solution. More even than the "Corpus Articuli," they give us an idea of the extraordinary genius of the author of the "Summa" by showing us how the Angelical Doctor arrived at his conclusions. They thus serve the same purpose as the *status questionis* with which the proof of the proposition is prefaced in our modern treatises and books. Certainly these objections should have been given as a means of meeting modern errors (for error too is old, although its dress be new), and also as a means of presenting in the answers to them, that comprehensive assemblage of principles needed for a thorough knowledge of each question. It probably was necessary to sacrifice something to brevity, but we cannot help feeling that Fr. Rickaby has thrown too great a sop to Cerberus.

Nevertheless, despite these ill-judged omissions, as we cannot help deeming them, Fr. Rickaby's work is, in our opinion, the most valuable addition made in our times to ethical English literature. Modern authors, even the famous among them, will be amazed to find what a treasury the Church has, unknown to them, possessed for centuries in the magnificent "Summa," of St. Thomas Aquinas, which splendid work Fr. Rickaby has made known to the great English-speaking world, the greatest, most splendidly conceived, and most perfectly finished part wherein are discussed the questions which from Plato down to the most modern Hedonist and Utilitarian have interested mankind—human happiness, in what it consists, and how to attain to it. Fr. Rickaby not only makes known to them what is the Christian philosophy of life, the doctrines of Scripture and the Father, put on a scientific basis, but, also, he presents to them from the middle ages the picture of what a good man should be in all times.

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES, FROM THE FIRST ATTEMPTED COLONIZATION TO THE PRESENT TIME. With Portraits, Views, Maps, and Facsimiles. By *John Gilmary Shea*. New York, 1892. Vol. IV. From the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1843, to the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1866. New York, 1892.

Dr. John Gilmary Shea, deceased, wrote and published very many valuable works on a great variety of subjects, yet among them all there is no one, we hesitate not to say, that excels in value and importance his "History of the Catholic Church within the Limits of the United States." Each of the three volumes that preceded the volume now before us, received due notice in the REVIEW at the time it was given to the public. It remains for us to notice the fourth and concluding volume.

In this volume the history of the Catholic Church in the United States is narrated during the brief period of twenty-three years, from 1843 to 1866. As compared with the periods comprised in the three preceding volumes, it was a time of peaceful progress, few or no flagrant scandals and disorders arose within the Church in the United States,

and, excepting the "Native American" riots and the anti-Catholic public-school movement, no open or violent assaults were made upon the Church by the opponents of the Catholic religion.

During the preceding period the organization of the Church had been systematized and consolidated, the Ecclesiastical Province of Baltimore, which then comprised all the territory included within the then existing territory of the United States, had been divided, and numerous suffragan sees had been constituted. Five Provincial Councils and a number of Diocesan Synods had been held, the action of which had done much to strengthen the hands of the bishops, and to deepen the convictions of the clergy respecting their obligations to obey their bishops, and of the laity to obey their priests. Measures were adopted to increase the number of the ecclesiastical seminaries, colleges, convents, and schools that had been previously established, and other important movements for the promotion of the interests of religion were instituted.

Thus the way was prepared for greater progress of the Church during the period comprised in the volume before us. It was a period of great activity. During its continuance six additional Ecclesiastical Provinces were constituted, and many additional diocesan sees. The number of priests, churches, ecclesiastical seminaries, colleges, convents, and religious greatly increased, as did also the number of the laity, their piety and generosity in contributing to the support of the Church and its institutions. The foundations of our parochial school system were also laid. The emigration of Catholics from European countries, and especially from Ireland, greatly increased the numerical and material strength of the Church.

These various movements and others which we have left unmentioned, their results and consequences, the personages who prominently took part in them, are lucidly and faithfully described by Dr. Shea in the volume before us. We are entirely within the limits of truth when we say that there is not even a single important event that occurred in any diocese in the United States, nor any one person whose action or labors largely helped to build up the Church or promote its interests in any part of our country, who is left unmentioned in Dr. Shea's narrative.

The volume before us is a fitting close of a long and laborious life unsparingly devoted to the promotion of Catholic literature and the elucidation of the principles and history of the Catholic Church.

THE CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACE, OR THE FIRST APOSTLES OF EUROPE. With a Preface by the Rev. John Bernard Dalgairns. In two volumes, Vol. I., *The Conversion of the Franks and the English.* Vol. II., *St. Boniface and the Conversion of Germany.* By *Mrs. Hope*, Author of "Early Martyrs," etc. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.

These two volumes form a very valuable contribution to the history of the Church in times and among peoples about whom much has been written, yet much remains to be known and explained. They are not mere compilations, or reproductions of what others have written on the subject. They are the results of careful, discriminating study.

The first volume gives several chapters to the origin of the Germans, their political and social organization, their religion, their earliest intercourse with the Greeks and Romans, their invasions and relations to the Romans during five centuries, the early conversion of the Germans, St. Germanus, Attila, Sts. Loup, Gèneviève, Ursula, Leo, relapse of the Germans into paganism or heresy, the Irish Celts the last hope. Three successive chapters are then occupied with the conversion of the Franks.

Seven more chapters are occupied with investigations of the early life of St. Patrick, the condition and history of Ireland in ancient times, the labors of St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Columban, St. Columban's disciples. Part third of this first volume is occupied with an account, in eleven successive chapters, of the conversion of the English in Kent, Northumbria, Wessex, Mercia, Essex, and Sussex, a description of the characteristics of the conversion of England, English kings, queens and princesses, English bishops and abbots, St. Theodore and English schools.

The first chapter of the second volume gives an account of the first English missions to the European continent. In successive chapters the life and labors of St. Boniface are narrated, his first mission to Friesland, his first visit to Rome, his labors in Bavaria, Thuringia, Hesse, his subsequent visits to Rome, the condition of the Church in the countries above named, the Church in Austrasia and Neustria, the development of monastic life, the Carolingian dynasty, martyrdom of St. Boniface, Charlemagne, learning and education.

NUNTIATURBERICHTE GIOVANNI MORONES, vom Deutschen Königshofe 1539, 1540. Bearbeitet von *Prof. Dr. Franz*. Dülrich: Paderborn, Schönbach. 1892.

John Morone, Bishop of Modena, was papal nuncio at the court of Vienna, from 1536 till 1542, and his letters to the cardinal secretary of state during that lamentable period—that is, the very flood-tide of the Lutheran reformation—are invaluable to any one who wishes to obtain an insight into the true character of that revolution and the causes which contributed to its success. For eight long years the nuncio struggled hard in the effort to restore the authority of the Holy See in the revolted sections of Germany; and he, first of all and more clearly than his contemporaries, felt and proclaimed that his efforts were wasted in a hopeless cause. Instead of expending time and energy upon the futile task of bringing back the erring sheep, he advises the strengthening of the Catholic party and the pushing forward of needed reforms in discipline. The event fully proved the wisdom of his counsel. When the work of perfecting the Catholic reformation was undertaken in earnest, it was done without regard either to Lutheran theologians or to lukewarm politicians, and it was done well.

The fragmentary manner in which the publishing of original documents like the present, is set about in Europe is much to be regretted. Each new publication is merely a supplement to some preceding one, and in consequence it is extremely difficult to obtain a complete series. For instance, the state papers of Morone, so far as edited, have to be hunted up in three different collections. It were far preferable to issue one complete edition, incorporating, wherever necessary, the results of previous labors. Eventually, no doubt, this will be done, and not until the entire documents are before us in convenient shape, will it be possible to form a correct judgment upon past events. It is consoling to notice that the more information we gain respecting the policy of the Holy See and its agents, the more disposed we are to be proud of it.

POETICAL WORKS OF J. C. HEYWOOD. Vol. II. Second Revised Edition. Burns & Oates, London and New York. The Catholic Publication Society.

These two volumes are creditable to the Catholic Publication Society being in every way agreeable to the reader, in as far as paper and printing can make books agreeable. Mr. Heywood is well known as a writer of taste and learning. Three of the poem-plays contained in this edition have been before the public for several years, and have received kindly notice

from many sources. "Herodias," "Antonius," "Salome," are no longer new, and the fact that the author has revised them twice, is an evidence not only of his care but also of the interest his work has excited.

A poet who could not discourse of love would not be a poet, they say. Mr. Heywood is quite a love-poet, and indeed so much of a love-poet that we cannot commend his work to "Reading Circles" unless all the members be of a ripe age. Not that he is a realist, but whether influenced by Solomon or by the pagan classics or by pagan moderns, he devotes too many lines to the purely sensual aspects of "love." His motive is good, his moral is good, but he writes for men of "culture," and not for common folk. To literary men, to students of the poetry of the nineteenth century, Mr. Heywood's work will be interesting.

To the three dramas mentioned he adds here a fourth, entitled "Sforza," which has more elements of an acting play, and less of poetry, than the earlier works. There is room for a Catholic poet,—true poet, who, following the traditions of great Catholic art, uses things sensual measurably, rightly, to impress upon men the mystery, the philosophy, the incomparable beauty of the old law and the new,—of Jehovah and of Christ. In Mr. Heywood we see the possibilities of a great Catholic poet. Let him bury the past; or rather, building on it, lift up the new—the old-new—to the glory of truth in doctrine, in act, in emotion, in passion—to the glory of Christ and of His faith, in all things.

DREAMS AND DAYS. Poems. By *George Parsons Lathrop*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

Mr. Lathrop has a poet's soul; a rare love of nature, and a close friendship with her; a love of all things beautiful, a deep experience of life, honest, joyous, serious life; and a gift of happy expression. He sings best to the sound of the lyre, which emphasizes the personal feelings of the artist; and yet his sympathies are too wide, his emotions too lively, to be restrained within the limits of a single instrument. In this tasteful book, he has preserved, for our pleasure and instruction, memoranda of days and nights passed in the company of one Muse or another.

There was a time when the poet could look forward to a laurel crown, which, amid the plaudits of the admiring crowd, the greatest in the land should place upon his head. Now-a-days he must generally be satisfied with the poor, if willing praise of the reviewer. We must change all this. The poet deserves something more than wordy encouragement. Men and women should read his books, commit to memory his good poems, good stanzas, good lines; spread his name and his fame. In encouraging writers like Mr. Lathrop, Catholics should be especially forward. Healthy minds make healthy minds, and without health there can be no beauty. Our place it is to do all in our power to establish a school of thought, healthful, sound; and a school of art as perfect as art can be. Mr. Lathrop has not sung his last or his best song. Let us urge him on. He can, he will do more in the field of thought, and in the field of language,—beautiful thought and beautiful language.

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DI GERONIMO, S. J. By *A. M. Clarke*. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

This great Jesuit missionary (born 1642, died 1716) was filled, in the early years of his priestly career, with an intense desire of going into foreign parts to evangelize the heathen; but Providence had destined him for the no less necessary, and hardly less arduous, task of evangel-

izing his own countrymen of southern Italy. The renown of his great labors has not been dimmed by the two centuries which have well nigh elapsed since he changed the face of Naples and its surrounding territory. His biography has been repeatedly narrated in Italian, German and French; and that he is so little known to the English-speaking public indicates how defective our Catholic literature still remains. His foreign-looking name may have been a bar to his popularity. The old form of "St. Francis Jerome" could scarcely be permitted to stand, unless on St. Augustine's principle that "it is better grammarians should censure than that the people should fail to understand." Italians have always known him as *Francesco di Girolamo*, but the present author insists upon *Geronimo*. If the Saint is to be presented to priests and people for well-merited veneration, we must fix upon a name for him, and since *Geronimo* is as convenient as any other, let it remain, *with the G pronounced like J, and with the accent upon the antipenultimate.*

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM. P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. F. Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbauni, O. S. F. Pars IX. De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ. Pars X. De Sacramento Matrimonii, De Censuris atque De Irregularitatibus. Paderbonæ, 1892. Ed. Typographia Bonifaciana. Benziger Bros. New York.

These two parts conclude the third and last volume of this new edition of Father Elbel's Moral Theology. We have already noticed the work at very considerable length. Elbel died June 4, 1756. This edition is a republication of the fifth, revised and corrected by the author himself in 1751, but now brought down and corrected according to the latest decrees of the Holy See. There is no author quoted more frequently by S. Alphonsus than Elbel: and that his authority has not grown less is clear from Lehmkuhl, who says that "he deserves to be remembered amongst the classical and chief writers of moral theology."

With Lacroix and Elbel of the old authors, and Lehmkuhl, Sabetti and Ballerini of our own day, the priest's library will contain all that he needs on this branch of sacred science. The work is excellently printed, fine large type and good paper.

LECTURES ON SLAVERY AND SERFDOM IN EUROPE. By W. R. Brownlow, M.A., Canon of Plymouth. New York. Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, 1892.

Persons who wish to know how great a debt the world owes to Christianity with regard to the abolition of Slavery can learn it from this book. After an introductory chapter containing, among other interesting and important matters, the letter of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., to the Bishops of Brazil, on the subject of slavery, Canon Brownlow describes slavery in the Roman Empire, its horrors and demoralizing effects and the manner in which the Church first mitigated its severity and finally abolished it. He then contrasts Roman slavery with mediæval serfdom. In succeeding chapters he describes slavery and serfdom in England, in the British Colonies and Islands; serfdom in France, Germany, Hungary and Russia, and the manner in which it was abolished in each of these countries.

THE POSITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND WALES DURING THE LAST TWO CENTURIES. Retrospect and Forecast. Edited by the XV. Club. With a Preface by Lord Brayne, President of the Club. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1892.

This work received a prize of fifty guineas offered by the Fifteen Club for the best treatise on the Position of the Catholic Church in England

and Wales during the last Two Centuries, with special reference to the alleged progress of the Faith at the present time. Its purpose is to show the "mistake of thinking that England would rapidly return to the Faith," and until this delusion is destroyed there is little hope of real progress.

There is room, wide room, for differing with the writer's inferences and conclusions, but the book itself is very valuable, because of the many details it gives respecting the condition of the Catholic Church in different parts of England, and its statistical tables.

THE SACRAMENTALS OF THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. By *Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL.D.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1892.

This is a book especially intended for the instruction of lay members of the Church, and well has the intention been accomplished. The author first explains the nature of the sacramentals, the manner in which they produce their supernatural effects, and the difference between them and the seven Sacraments. In separate chapters, he describes and explains the Treasures of the Missal, of the Ritual, of the Breviary, Sign of the Cross, Way of the Cross, Holy Oils, The Asperges, Forty Hours' Adoration, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, the Rosary, Brown Scapular, the Angelus, Agnus Dei, etc.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII. By *Mary H. Allies.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.

We sincerely regret that regard for limits of space prevent us from giving a longer notice of this truly valuable work. It is not so much a history as it is a lucid exhibit and exposition of the interior meaning of historical facts and events connected with the history of the Church in England from the first dawn of Christianity to the accession of Henry VIII. To persons desirous of obtaining a clear and correct understanding of the causes and reasons of the vicissitudes and conflicts which the Church in England had to encounter during the period mentioned, this work is invaluable.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO SOCIETY. Theological Essays by *Edmund J. O'Reilly, S.J.* (Sometime Professor of Theology in Maynooth College, at St. Beuno's in North Wales, and in the Catholic University of Ireland). Edited, with a biographical notice by *Mathew Russel, S.J.* London: John Hodges, 1892.

This is a collection of very able essays on revelation and the natural law, the nature of the Catholic Church, its pastoral office, its legislation, its executive power—the clergy, education, church property, the definition of Papal infallibility, obedience due to the Pope, liberty of conscience, marriage laws as affecting Protestants, the Church and politics, the Pope's temporal power, etc.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. IGNATIUS. Translated from the French of Father Xavier De Franciosi, S. J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1892.

We take pleasure in recommending this book to English-speaking Catholics. It has been aptly called the "Spirit of St. Ignatius," for in every page, in every line of it, the Saint is living and breathing; and as no one could come in contact with the Saint without being benefited spiritually, so do we feel it must be with all who will read this book.

THE HAIL MARY, or Popular Instructions and Considerations on the Angelical Salvation. By *J. P. Val D'Eremao, D.D.* Author of "The Serpent of Eden," "The Keys of Peter," "Practical Guide to Meditation," etc. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

The title-page of this book as given above, sufficiently describes its contents. The "instructions" are lucid and interesting and the "considerations" are highly edifying. It would be well if the book were in the home of every English-speaking family.

LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE. London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The notice prepared for this valuable book is crowded out by other and possibly less important matter, and will appear in our next number.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[Some of the books mentioned under this head were received too late for careful examination; notices were prepared of a number of others, but were omitted owing to want of space to insert them. The mention of their titles here does not preclude further notice of them in a subsequent number of the REVIEW.]

THE STATE. ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL POLITICS. A Sketch of Institutional History and Administration. By *Woodrow Wilson, Ph.D., LL.D.*, Author of "Congressional Government." Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1892.

LIFE OF THE BLESSED ANGELINA OF MARSIANO, Virgin. Compiled from Ancient Documents by the *Honorable Mrs. A. Montgomery*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

THE SPIRIT OF THE SACRED HEART. A Manual of Prayers. Compiled from many approved sources. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

FIFTY-TWO SHORT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF OUR HOLY RELIGION. From the French, by *Rev. Thomas F. Ward*. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1892.

THEOLOGIA PASTORALIS COMPLECTENS PRACTICAM INSTITUTIONEM CONFESSARII. Auctore *Jos. Aertnys, C. SS. R.* Tornaci, 1892. Received from Burns & Oates.

THE FREE-TRADE STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND. By *M. M. Trumbull*. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1892.

THE CONFESSOR AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART: From the French of the Third Edition of *Rev. Father L. J. M. Cros, S. J.* Browne & Nolan, Dublin. 1892.

FLORINE, PRINCESS OF BURGUNDY. A Tale of the First Crusade. By *Wm. Bernard McCabe*. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co. 1892.

We have received the following works from the publishing houses named below:

From Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago:

A MARTYR OF OUR OWN TIMES. Life of *Rev. Just de Bretenières*, Missionary Apostolic, Martyred in Corea in 1866. From the French of *Rt. Rev. Mgr. D'Hulst*. Edited by *Very Rev. J. R. Slattery*, Rector of St. Joseph's Seminary, Baltimore.

HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS IN PURGATORY. Prayers and Devotions in Aid of the Suffering Souls. By *Joseph Ackerman*. Edited by *Rev. F. B. Luebberrmann*, Editor of the "Poor Soul's Advocate."

AN EXPLANATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. For the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and Advanced Classes. By *Rev. Thomas L. Kinkead*.

CONTINUITY OR COLLAPSE? The Question of Church Defence. By *Canon McCave, D.D.* and the *Rev. J. D. Breen, O.S.B.*; edited by the *Rev. J. B. McKinlay, O.S.B.* New Edition.

LIFE OF BLESSED PETER ALOYSIUS MARY CHANEL, MARIST, First Martyr of Oceania and Apostle of Fortuna. From the French. Edited by Basil Tozer.

THE JOURNEY OF THE MAGI KINGS. From "The Life of the Blessed Virgin," after the Meditations of *Sister Anne Catherine Emmerich*.

ON CHRISTIAN ART. By *Edith Healy*, with an Introduction by *Right Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria.

TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. From the Spanish of *F. de P. Capella*. Edited by Henry Wilson.

THE TRIAL OF MARGARET BRERETON. By *Pleydell North*, Author of "M. le Cure," "Russian Violets," etc.

ST. THERESA'S OWN WORDS; or, INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRAYER OF RECOLLECTION.

SIMPLICITY IN PRAYER. By the Author of "Les Petites Fleurs." From the French.

GERTRUDE'S EXPERIENCE. By *Mrs. Mary C. Monroe*. From the French.

THE BRIC-A-BRAC DEALER. Translated from the French.

From Catholic Publication Society Co., New York; and Burns & Oates, London:

THE INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Translated from the French of the *Rev. J. Grou*, of the Society of Jesus. Edited, with a Biographical Sketch and Preface, by *Rev. S. H. Frisbee, S.J.* In two volumes.

THE CHURCH; OR THE SOCIETY OF DIVINE PRAISE; A Manual for the Use of the Oblates of St. Benedict. From the French of *Dom Prosper Guéranger*, Abbot of Solesmes.

MY ZOUAVE. By *Mrs. Bartle Teeling*, Author of "Roman Violets," etc.

From Art and Book Company, London; and Benziger Brothers, New York:

THE LADY OF THE RAVEN'S COMBE. By *E. H. Dering*, Author of "Memoirs of Georgianna, Lady Chatterton," "In the Light of the XXth Century," etc., etc.

GERTRUDE MANNERING; A Tale of Self-Sacrifice. By *Frances Noble*, Author of "Madeline's Destiny."

THE HEIR OF LASCARRAGH. By *Victor O'D. Power*, Author of "Bonnie Dunraven," etc.

From M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin:

MEDITATIONS ON THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF RELIGION AND ON THE HIDDEN AND PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By *The Most Rev. Dr. Kirby*, Archbishop of Ephesus. Rector of the Irish College at Rome.

THE BIRTH-DAY BOOK OF THE MADONNA. Compiled by *Vincent O'Brien*, Editor of "The Birth-Day Book of the Sacred Heart."

From John Murphy & Co., Baltimore:

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE CATACOMBS. By *Rev. Thomas J. Strahan, D.D.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University of America.

ADA'S TRUST. By *Ana Hanson Dorsey*, Author of "Cocaina," "Flemmings," etc.

THE STOLEN CHILD. By *Henrick Conscience*.

From Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati:

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. A Short Explanation of the Meaning of the Ceremonies of the Mass. Useful to All who take Part in the Sacred Mysteries. By *Rev. F. X. Schouppe, S.J.* Translated by the *Rev. P. O'Hare, S.J.*

From Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago; and Browne & Nolan, Dublin:

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By *Rev. Daniel O'Loon*, Dean Maynooth College.

From McCauley & Kilner, Baltimore:

CHRIST OUR TEACHER. Translated from the French by *Father J. B. St. Jure, S.B.* With an Introduction by His Eminence *James Cardinal Gibbons*.

From Pollard & Moss, New York, and Burns & Oates, London:

FREVILLE CHASE. By *E. H. Dering*, Author of "Sherborne," "Memoirs of Georgianna, Lady Chatterton," etc.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

ZOM-B-46

205
A5123

American C
1892

NAME.

DATE

